BOHN'S STANDARD LIBRARY.

Post 8vo., Elegantly Printed, and bound in Cloth, at 3s. 6d. per Vol.

1 THE MISCELLANEOUS WORKS AND REMAINS OF THE REV. ROBERT HALL, with Memoir by DR. GREGORY, and Essay by JOHN FOSTER. *Portrait.*

2 & 3. ROSCOE'S LIFE AND PONTIFICATE OF LEO X., Edited by his Son, with the Copyright Notes, Documents, &c. In 2 Vols. *Portraits.*

4. SCHLEGEL'S LECTURES ON THE PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY. Translated from the German, with a Memoir by J. B. ROBERTSON, Esq. *Portrait.*

5 & 6. SISMONDI'S HISTORY OF THE LITERATURE OF THE SOUTH OF EUROPE. Translated by ROSCOE. In 2 Vols. *Portraits.*

7. ROSCOE'S LIFE OF LORENZO DE MEDICI, with the Copyright Notes, &c.

8. SCHLEGEL'S LECTURES ON DRAMATIC LITERATURE. *Portrait.*

6.29.06.

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Rev. Wm. B. Scarborough

Division D102

Section M64

V. 3

29. SHERIDAN'S DRAMATIC WORKS AND LIFE.

31. GOETHE'S WORKS. Vol. I. [His Autobiography. 13 Books.] *Portrait.*

35. WHEATLEY ON THE COMMON PRAYER. *Frontispiece.*

37, 39, 40, 81, & 86. MILTON'S PROSE WORKS. In 5 Vols, with general Index and *Portraits.*

38, 41, & 45. MENZEL'S HISTORY OF GERMANY. Complete in 3 Vols. *Portrait.*

42. SCHLEGEL'S ÆSTHETIC AND MISCELLANEOUS WORKS.

43. GOETHE'S WORKS. Vol. II. [Remainder of his Autobiography, and Travels.]

44. SCHILLER'S WORKS. Vol. IV. ["The Robbers," "Fiesko," "Love and Intrigue," and "The Ghost-Seer."] Translated by HENRY G. BOHN.

2 *b*

46. SCHLEGEL'S LECTURES ON MODERN HISTORY.

47. LAMARTINE'S HISTORY OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION OF 1848.

48 & 50. JUNIUS'S LETTERS, with Notes, Additions, Essay, Index, &c. 2 Vols.

49, 55, 60, 65, 71. VASARI'S LIVES OF THE MOST CELEBRATED PAINTERS, SCULPTORS, AND ARCHITECTS. Translated by MRS. FOSTER, with Notes. Complete in 5 Vols., with Index.

51. TAYLOR'S (JEREMY) HOLY LIVING AND DYING. *Portrait.*

52. GOETHE'S WORKS. Vol. III. ["Faust," "Iphigenia," "Torquato Tasso," and "Egmont."] Translated by MISS SWANWICK. With "Goetz von Berlichingen," translated by SIR WALTER SCOTT.

53, 56, 58, 61, 66, 67, 75, & 82. NEANDER'S CHURCH HISTORY. Carefully revised by the REV. A. J. W. MORRISON. 8 Vols. With Index.

54. NEANDER'S LIFE OF CHRIST.

57, 64. NEANDER'S PLANTING OF CHRISTIANITY, & ANTIGNOSTIKUS, 2 Vols.

59. GREGORY'S (DR.) LETTERS ON THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

62 & 63. JAMES' (G. P. R.) LOUIS XIV. Complete in 2 Vols. *Portraits.*

68 & 70. SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS' LITERARY WORKS, with Memoir, 2 Vols. *Port.*

69. ANDREW FULLER'S PRINCIPAL WORKS. *Portrait.*

72. BUTLER'S ANALOGY OF RELIGION, AND SERMONS, with Notes, &c. *Portrait.*

73. MISS BREMER'S WORKS. Translated by MARY HOWITT. New Edition, revised. Vol. I. ["The Neighbours," and other Tales.] Post 8vo. *Portrait.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

74. NEANDER'S MEMORIALS OF CHRISTIAN LIFE IN THE EARLY AND MIDDLE AGES (including his "Light in Dark Places"). Post 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

76. MISS BREMER'S WORKS, by MARY HOWITT. Vol. II. "The President's Daughters." *Portrait.*

77 & 80. JOHN FOSTER'S LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE, edited by J. E. RYLAND. In 2 Volumes. *Portrait.*

78. BACON'S ESSAYS, APOPHTHEGMS, WISDOM OF THE ANCIENTS, NEW ATALANTIS, AND HENRY VII., with Dissertation and Notes. *Portrait.*

79. GUIZOT'S HISTORY OF REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT, translated from the French by A. R. SCOBLE. With Index.

83. MISS BREMER'S WORKS, by MARY HOWITT. Vol. III. "The Home, and Strife and Peace."

84. DE LOLME ON THE CONSTITUTION OF ENGLAND, or, Account of the English Government; edited, with Life and Notes, by JOHN MACGREGOR, M.P.

85. HISTORY OF THE HOUSE OF AUSTRIA, from 1792 to the present time; in continuation of COXE. *Portrait of the present Emperor.*

87 & 88. FOSTER'S LECTURES, edited by J. E. RYLAND. 2 vols.

89. MISS BREMER'S WORKS, by MARY HOWITT. Vol IV. "A Diary; The H——— Family; The Solitary; The Comforter; Axel and Anna; and a Letter about Suppers."

90. SMITH'S (ADAM) THEORY OF MORAL SENTIMENTS; and "Essay on the First Formation of Languages," with Memoir by DUGALD STEWART.

91, 95, 96, 99, 102, 103, 105, & 106. COWPER'S COMPLETE WORKS, Edited by SOUTHEY; comprising his Poems, Correspondence, and Translations, with Southey's Memoir. *With* 50 *Engravings on Steel.* Complete in 8 vols.

92. **DANUBIAN PROVINCES.**—RANKE'S History of Servia, The Servian Revolution, The Insurrection in Bosnia, and The Slave Provinces of Turkey. Translated by MRS. KERR.

93. **GOETHE'S ELECTIVE AFFINITIES, SORROWS OF WERTHER, GERMAN EMIGRANTS, GOOD WOMEN; and A NOUVELETTE.**

94. **THE CARAFAS OF MADDALONI:** Naples under Spanish Dominion. Translated from the German of ALFRED DE ROUMONT. *Portrait of Masaniello.*

97 & 109. **CONDÉ'S HISTORY OF THE ARABS IN SPAIN.** Translated from the Spanish by MRS. FOSTER. In 3 vols. Vols. I. and II. *Frontispiece.*

98 & 104. **LOCKE'S PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS,** containing the Essay on the Human Understanding, the Conduct of the Understanding, &c., with Notes by J. A. ST. JOHN, Esq. General Index and a *Portrait.* In 2 vols.

100. **HUNGARY: ITS HISTORY AND REVOLUTIONS.** With a copious Memoir of KOSSUTH, from new and authentic sources. *Portrait of Kossuth.*

101. **HISTORY OF RUSSIA** to the present time, compiled from KARAMSIN, TOOKE, and SEGUR, by W. K. KELLY. In 2 vols. Vol. I., *Portrait of Catherine the Second.*

107 & 108. **JAMES'S (G. P. R.), LIFE OF RICHARD CŒUR DE LION,** King of England. New Edition, with portraits of Richard, and Philip Augustus. Complete in 2 vols.

BOHN'S EXTRA VOLUMES.

Uniform with the STANDARD LIBRARY, *price 3s. 6d.*

1. **GRAMMONT'S MEMOIRS OF THE COURT OF CHARLES II.** *Portrait.*
2 & 3. **RABELAIS' WORKS.** Complete in 2 Vols. *Portrait.*
4. **COUNT HAMILTON'S FAIRY TALES.** *Portrait.*
5. **BOCCACCIO'S DECAMERON,** a complete translation, by W. K. KELLY, Esq. *Portrait.*

UNIFORM WITH THE STANDARD LIBRARY,

BARBAULD'S (MRS.) SELECTIONS FROM THE SPECTATOR, TATLER, GUARDIAN, AND FREEHOLDER. In 2 Vols. *3s. 6d.* per Volume.

BRITISH POETS, from MILTON to KIRKE WHITE, Cabinet Edition, comprising, in a very small but remarkably clear type, as much matter as the sixty volumes of Johnson's Poets. Complete in 4 Vols. *Frontispieces.* 14*s.*

CARY'S TRANSLATION OF DANTE. Extra cloth. *7s. 6d.*

CATTERMOLE'S EVENINGS AT HADDON HALL. 24 exquisite Engravings on Steel, from Designs by himself; the Letter-Press by the BARONESS DE CALABRELLA. Post 8vo. *7s. 6d.*

CHILLINGWORTH'S RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS. *3s. 6d.*

CLASSIC TALES; comprising The Vicar of Wakefield, Elizabeth, Paul and Virginia, Gulliver's Travels, Sterne's Sentimental Journey, Sorrows of Werter, Theodosius and Constantia, Castle of Otranto, and Rasselas. 12mo. 7 *Portraits.* *3s. 6d.*

DEMOSTHENES. Translated by LELAND. *Portrait.* *3s.*

DICKSON AND MOWBRAY ON POULTRY, Edited by MRS. LOUDON, Illustrations by HARVEY (including the Cochin-China Fowl). *5s.*

HORACE'S ODES AND EPODES, translated literally and rhythmically, by the REV. W. SEWELL. *3s. 6d.*

IRVING'S (WASHINGTON) WORKS. Complete in 10 Vols., £1 15*s.*, or *3s. 6d.* per Vol.

JOYCE'S SCIENTIFIC DIALOGUES. Greatly Improved Edition, with Questions, &c., by PINNOCK. (Upwards of 600 pages). *Woodcuts.* *5s.*

JOYCE'S INTRODUCTION TO THE ARTS AND SCIENCES. *5s.*

LAMARTINE'S HISTORY OF THE RESTORATION. 4 vols., post 8vo., new Edition, with a General Index, and 5 additional *Portraits, viz.*, Lamartine, Talleyrand, Lafayette, Ney, and Louis XVII. Cloth.

LAMARTINE'S THREE MONTHS IN POWER. Sewed, *2s.*

LAMARTINE'S POETICAL MEDITATIONS AND RELIGIOUS HARMONIES, with Biographical Sketch. *Portrait.* Cloth, *3s. 6d.*

LAWRENCE'S LECTURES ON COMPARATIVE ANATOMY, PHYSIOLOGY, ZOOLOGY, AND THE NATURAL HISTORY OF MAN. *Frontispiece and Plates.* *5s.*

LILLY'S INTRODUCTION TO ASTROLOGY. A New and Improved Edition, by ZADKIEL, with his Grammar of Astrology, and Tables of Nativities. *5s.*

LOUDON'S (MRS.) ENTERTAINING NATURALIST, a Description of more than Five Hundred Animals, with Indexes of Scientific and Popular Names. *With upwards of* 500 *Woodcuts, by* BEWICK, HARVEY, &c. Revised and enlarged. *7s. 6d.*

LOWTH'S LECTURES ON THE SACRED POETRY OF THE HEBREWS. *3s. 6d.*

MICHELET'S HISTORY OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION. *4s.*

MILLER'S PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY. Third Revised and Improved Edition, 4 Volumes, at *3s. 6d.* per Volume.

MITFORD'S (MISS) OUR VILLAGE. 2 Vols., New Edition, *with Woodcuts and beautiful Frontispieces on Steel,* gilt cloth. Each Vol. *5s.*

NORWAY. A Road Book for Tourists in Norway, with Hints to English Sportsmen and Anglers, by THOMAS FORESTER, Esq. Limp cloth. *2s.*

PARKES' ELEMENTARY CHEMISTRY. New Edition, revised, *5s.*

UNIFORM WITH THE STANDARD LIBRARY.

SHAKSPEARE'S PLAYS AND POEMS, with Life, by CHALMERS. In 1 Vol. *3s. 6d.*

——— the same, Embellished with 40 pleasing *Steel Engravings,* elegantly bound in red Turkey cloth, gilt edges. *5s.*

STANDARD LIBRARY CYCLOPÆDIA OF POLITICAL, CONSTITUTIONAL, STATISTICAL, AND FORENSIC KNOWLEDGE. 4 Vols. *3s. 6d.* each.

This work contains as much as eight ordinary octavos. It was first published in another shape by Mr. Charles Knight, under the title of Political Dictionary, at £1 16*s.* The Compiler, MR. GEORGE LONG, is one of the most competent Scholars of the day.

STURM'S MORNING COMMUNINGS WITH GOD. New Edition. *5s.*

UNCLE TOM'S CABIN, with Introductory Remarks by the REV. J. SHERMAN (printed in a large clear type, with head-lines of Contents). *2s. 6d.*

——— The same, on fine paper, with 8 *new Illustrations by* LEECH *and* GILBERT, *and a beautiful Frontispiece by* HINCHLIFF. *3s. 6d.*

THE WIDE, WIDE WORLD, by ELIZABETH WETHERELL. Complete in 1 Vol, *with Frontispiece,* gilt edges. *3s. 6d.*

——— The same, *Illustrated with 9 highly finished Engravings on Steel,* richly bound in cloth, gilt edges. *5s.*

BOHN'S SCIENTIFIC LIBRARY.

Uniform with the STANDARD LIBRARY, *price 5s., (excepting "Cosmos," Kidd, and Whewell, which are 3s. 6d., and Mantell's "Petrifactions," which is 6s.)*

1. **STAUNTON'S CHESS PLAYER'S HAND-BOOK,** *with Diagrams.*
2. **LECTURES ON PAINTING,** by THE ROYAL ACADEMICIANS.
3. **4, 8, & 15. HUMBOLDT'S COSMOS;** or, Sketch of a Physical Description of the Universe. Translated, with Notes, by E. C. OTTE. In 4 Vols., *with fine Portrait.* This Translation (though published at so low a price) is more complete than any other. The Notes are placed beneath the text. Humboldt's analytica summaries, and the passages hitherto suppressed, are included; and comprehensive Indices subjoined. *3s. 6d.* per Volume.
5. **STAUNTON'S CHESS PLAYER'S COMPANION,** comprising a New Treatise on Odds, a Collection of Match Games, Original Problems, &c.
6. **HAND-BOOK OF GAMES,** by VARIOUS AMATEURS and PROFESSORS.
7. **HUMBOLDT'S VIEWS OF NATURE,** *with coloured view of Chimborazo, &c.*
9. **RICHARDSON'S GEOLOGY, AND PALÆONTOLOGY,** Revised by Dr. WRIGHT, *with upwards of 400 Illustrations on Wood.*
10. **STOCKHARDT'S PRINCIPLES OF CHEMISTRY,** Exemplified in Simple Experiments, *with upwards of 270 Illustrations.*
11. **DR. G. A. MANTELL'S PETRIFACTIONS AND THEIR TEACHINGS;** A Hand-Book to the Fossils in the British Museum. *Beautiful Wood Engravings.* 6*s.*

BOHN'S SCIENTIFIC LIBRARY.

12. AGASSIZ AND GOULD'S COMPARATIVE PHYSIOLOGY. New and Enlarged Edition, *with nearly* 400 *Illustrations.*
13, 19, & 28. HUMBOLDT'S PERSONAL NARRATIVE OF HIS TRAVELS IN AMERICA. With General Index.
14. PYE SMITH'S GEOLOGY AND SCRIPTURE. Fifth Edition, with Memoir.
16. OERSTED'S SOUL IN NATURE, &c. *Portrait.*
17. STAUNTON'S CHESS TOURNAMENT, *with Diagrams.*
18 & 20. BRIDGEWATER TREATISES. KIRBY on the History, Habits, and Instincts of Animals; Edited by T. RYMER JONES. In 2 Vols. *Many Illustrations.*
21. BRIDGEWATER TREATISES. KIDD On the Adaptation of External Nature to the Physical Condition of Man. 3*s.* 6*d.*
22. BRIDGEWATER TREATISES. WHEWELL'S Astronomy and General Physics, considered with reference to Natural Theology. *Portrait of the Earl of Bridgewater.* 3*s.* 6*d.*
23. SCHOUW'S EARTH, PLANTS, AND MAN, and KOBELL'S SKETCHES FROM THE MINERAL KINGDOM, Translated by A. HENFREY, F.R.S., &c., *with Coloured Map of the Geography of Plants.*
24. BRIDGEWATER TREATISES. CHALMERS on the Adaptation of External Nature to the Moral and Intellectual Constitution of Man, with the Author's last Corrections, and Biographical Sketch by the REV. DR. CUMMING.
25. BACON'S NOVUM ORGANUM AND ADVANCEMENT OF LEARNING. Complete, with Notes, by J. DEVEY, M.A.
26 & 27. HUMPHREY'S COIN COLLECTOR'S MANUAL: a popular introduction to the Study of Coins, ancient and modern; with elaborate Indexes, *and numerous highly-finished Engravings on Wood and Steel,* 2 Vols.
29. COMTE'S PHILOSOPHY OF THE SCIENCES, Edited from the 'Cours de Philosophie Positive,' by G. H. LEWES, Esq.
30. MANTELL'S (DR.) GEOLOGICAL EXCURSIONS, including THE ISLE OF WIGHT. New Edition, with Prefatory Note by T. RUPERT JONES, Esq., *numerous beautiful Woodcuts, and a Geological Map.*
31. HUNT'S POETRY OF SCIENCE; or, Studies of the Physical Phenomena of Nature. 3rd Edition, revised and enlarged.
32 & 33. ENNEMOSER'S HISTORY OF MAGIC, Translated from the German by WILLIAM HOWITT. With an Appendix of the most remarkable and best authenticated Stories of Apparitions, Dreams, Second Sight, Predictions, Divinations, Vampires, Fairies, Table Turning, and Spirit Rapping, &c., by MARY HOWITT. In 2 Vols.
34. HUNT'S ELEMENTARY PHYSICS; an Introduction to the Study of Natural Philosophy. New Edition, revised. *Numerous Woodcuts and Coloured Frontispiece.*

BOHN'S ILLUSTRATED LIBRARY.

Uniform with the STANDARD LIBRARY, *at* 5*s. per volume,*

1 to 8. LODGE'S PORTRAITS OF ILLUSTRIOUS PERSONAGES OF GREAT BRITAIN. 8 Vols. post 8vo. 240 *Portraits.*
9. CRUIKSHANK'S THREE COURSES AND DESSERT, *with* 50 *Illustrations.*
10. PICKERING'S RACES OF MAN, *with numerous Portraits* (*or Coloured* 7*s.* 6*d.*)
11. KITTO'S SCRIPTURE LANDS, AND BIBLICAL ATLAS, *with* 24 *Maps,* (*or Coloured,* 7*s.* 6*d.*)

7 *b*

12. **WHITE'S NATURAL HISTORY OF SELBORNE,** with Notes by Sir Wm. Jardine and others, edited, with large additions, by E. Jesse, Esq. *With* 40 *highly-finished Wood Engravings (Coloured, 7s. 6d.)*

13. **DIDRON'S CHRISTIAN ICONOGRAPHY,** *with* 150 *beautiful Engravings.* In 2 Vols. Vol. I.

14. **REDDING ON WINES.** New and Revised Edition, *with* 20 *beautiful Woodcuts.*

15 & 16. **ALLEN'S BATTLES OF THE BRITISH NAVY.** New Edition. Enlarged by the Author. *Numerous fine Portraits* on Steel. 2 Vols.

17 & 18. **ROME IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.** Fifth Edition, in 2 Vols., *with* 34 *fine Steel Engravings,* and Index.

19. **MAXWELL'S VICTORIES OF WELLINGTON AND THE BRITISH ARMIES,** *with Engravings on Steel.*

20. **LIFE OF WELLINGTON,** by "An Old Soldier," compiled from the materials of Maxwell, and continued by an eminent Author, with an Account of the Funeral. *With* 18 *highly finished Engravings on Steel.*

21. **MARY AND WM. HOWITT'S STORIES OF ENGLISH AND FOREIGN LIFE,** *with* 20 *beautiful Steel Engravings.*

22. **BECHSTEIN'S CAGE and CHAMBER BIRDS,** including Sweet's Warblers. New Edition, greatly enlarged, *numerous Plates (or Coloured, 7s. 6d.)*

23. **NORWAY AND ITS SCENERY,** comprising Price's Journal, with large Additions and a Road Book. Edited by Thos. Forester, Esq. *With* 22 *Illustrations, beautifully Engraved on Steel by Lucas.*

*** The Road Book is sold separately, price 2*s.*

24. **CHINA: PICTORIAL, DESCRIPTIVE, AND HISTORICAL,** with some account of Ava and the Burmese, Siam and Assam. *Illustrated by nearly* 100 *Engravings on Wood.*

25. **PICTORIAL HANDBOOK OF LONDON,** comprising its Antiquities, Architecture, Arts, Manufactures, Trade, Social, Literary, and Scientific Institutions, Exhibitions, and Galleries of Art, &c. *Illustrated with* 205 *Engravings on Wood, and a large and complete Map.*

This volume, of which the former editions were published by Mr. Weale at 9*s.*, contains above 900 pages.

26. **MARY HOWITT'S PICTORIAL CALENDAR OF THE SEASONS,** exhibiting the Pleasures, Pursuits, and Characteristics of Country Life, for every Month in the Year; and embodying the whole of Aiken's Calendar of Nature. *Upwards of* 100 *Illustrations.*

27. **DANTE,** translated into English Verse by I. C. Wright, M.A. Third Edition, carefully revised. *Portrait and* 34 *Illustrations on Steel, after* Flaxman.

28 & 29. **MUDIE'S BRITISH BIRDS,** or History of the Feathered Tribes of the British Islands. Fifth Edition, revised by W. C. L. Martin, Esq. Complete in 2 Vols., *with* 52 *figures of Birds, and* 7 *additional Plates of Eggs.* (*Or, with the Plates Coloured, 7s. 6d.* per Vol.)

30. **TASSO'S JERUSALEM DELIVERED,** translated into English Spenserian verse, with a Life of the Author by J. H. Wiffen. Fourth Edition. 24 *Engravings by* Thurston *on Wood, and* 8 *on Steel.*

31. **INDIA: PICTORIAL, DESCRIPTIVE, and HISTORICAL,** from the Earliest Times to the Present. *Illustrated by upwards of* 100 *Engravings on Wood, and Map of Hindoostan.*

32. **NICOLINI'S HISTORY OF THE JESUITS:** their Origin, Progress, Doctrines, and Designs. *Portraits of* Loyola, Lainez, Xavier, Borgia, Acquaviva, Père la Chaise, Ricci, and Pope Ganganelli.

33. **ROBINSON CRUSOE,** with Illustrations by Stothard and Harvey, 12 *beautiful Engravings on Steel, and* 74 *on Wood.*

HISTORY,

PHILOSOPHICALLY ILLUSTRATED,

FROM

THE FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE,

TO

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

BY

GEORGE MILLER, D.D., M.R.I.A.,

VICAR GENERAL OF ARMAGH; FORMERLY FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN, AND LECTURER ON MODERN HISTORY.

Third Edition,

REVISED BY THE AUTHOR.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.—VOL. III.

LONDON:
H. G. BOHN, YORK STREET, COVENT GARDEN.
1853.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME THE THIRD.

BOOK III.

REVIEW OF MODERN HISTORY FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE BRITISH REVOLUTION.

PAGE

CHAPTER I.—Of the history of Germany and Italy, from the commencement of the reign of Charles V. in the year 1519, to his abdication in the year 1556 . . 1

The reformation of religion, which had been begun by Luther in the year 1517, decided by the decree of Worms—Wars with France and Turkey begun, 1521—*Hundred grievances* of Germany, 1522—The Lutherans begin to associate, 1523—League of the Roman Catholics, 1524—League of the Lutherans: Hungary and Bohemia again acquired by the Austrian family, 1526—Protestation of the Lutherans against the decree of the diet of Spire, and name of Protestants assumed; the Turks besiege Vienna, 1529—Confession of Augsburg; extinction of Italian independence, 1530—Machiavel—Ferdinand king of the Romans, 1531—League of the Protestants at Smalkalde, 1536—League of the Roman Catholics at Nuremberg, 1538—Order of Jesuits instituted, 1540—Calvin establishes his system at Geneva, 1541—Council of Trent assembled, 1545—Death of Luther; the League of Smalkalde take arms, 1546—The Protestants of Germany league with France, 1551—The Peace of Passau, 1552—The reformation established in Germany, 1555—Abdication of Charles V., 1556—Pontificate of Leo X.—Ariosto, Tasso, Michael Angelo, Raffael, Galileo Torricelli.

CHAPTER II.—Of the history of Spain and Portugal, from the commencement of the reign of the emperor Charles V. in Spain, in the year 1516, to that of the reign of Philip III. of Spain, in the year 1598. . . . 37

Charles king of Spain, in the year 1516—Cortes of Castile ruined, 1539—Philip prince of Spain married to Mary of Eng-

PAGE

land, 1554—Philip II. king of Spain, 1556—Death of Mary, 1558—Persecution of the Netherlands begun, 1559—The Turks repulsed from Malta, 1565—defeated at Lepanto, 1571—War of the Netherlands begun, 1572—Union of Utrecht formed, 1578—Armada sent against England, 1588—The constitution of Aragon abolished, 1592—The Dutch first sailed to India, 1595—The government of Spain bankrupt, 1596—Portuguese empire in India completed, 1547—Portugal united with Spain, 1580—Garcilaso de la Vega, Cervantes, Lope de Vega, Calderon, Bernardim Ribeyro, Camoens.

CHAPTER III.—Of the history of France, from the commencement of the reign of Francis I. in the year 1515 to that of the reign of Louis XIII. in the year 1610 . 70

Francis I. king in the year 1515—Civil wars begun, 1562—Massacre of Saint Bartholomew's day, 1572—Henry III. assassinated and Henry IV. king, 1589—Civil wars ended, and edict of Nantes, 1598—Henry IV. assassinated, 1610.

CHAPTER IV.—Of the histories of Russia and Poland, from the commencement of the sixteenth century to that of the German war of thirty years in the year 1618 94

Siberia acquired by Russia in the year 1581—The Russian church independent, 1588—The crown of Poland simply elective, 1579—Poland united with Sweden, 1592—The union dissolved, 1604.

CHAPTER V.—Of the histories of Denmark and Sweden, from the dissolution of the union of Calmar in the year 1524, to the commencement of the German war of thirty years in the year 1618. 109

War of Denmark with Lubeck, in the year 1534—Peace with Lubeck, and the reformation established in Denmark, 1536—War begun with Sweden, 1563—ended, 1570—War again begun with Sweden, 1611—ended, 1612—The reformation established in Sweden, 1528—War with Lubeck, 1534—ended, 1536—War with Russia, 1555—War of Livonia, 1561—War with the hanseatic cities, 1562—War with Denmark, 1563—Sweden united with Poland, 1592—War with Russia ended, 1595—Union with Poland dissolved, and war begun, 1604—War with the Poles in Russia begun, 1609—War with Denmark begun, 1611—ended, 1612—War with the Poles in Russia, ended, and Ingria acquired by Sweden, 1617—Copernicus, Tycho Brahé.

CHAPTER VI.—Of the history of Germany, from the abdication of Charles V. in the year 1556, to the conclusion of the war of thirty years in the year 1648. . 127

PAGE

The imperial dignity independent of the papacy, and the council of Trent dissolved, in the year 1563—The war of thirty years begun, 1618—The Danes began to support the Protestants, 1625—make peace, 1629—The Swedes invade Germany, 1630—The Protestants of Germany make an alliance with France, 1634—The war ended, 1648—Kepler.

CHAPTER VII.—Of the treaty of Westphalia, and other arrangements connected with it, from the year 1648 to the year 1669. 148

Treaty of Westphalia in the year 1648—Treaty of the Pyrenees, 1659—Treaty of Lisbon, 1668—Treaty of the Hague, 1669.

CHAPTER VIII.—Of the history of the northern governments of Europe, from the commencement of the war of thirty years, in the year 1618, to the treaties of Oliva and Copenhagen, concluded in the year 1660. . 166

War of Poland with the Cossacks in the year 1638—War with Sweden begun, 1655—Treaties of Oliva and Copenhagen concluded, and the Danish monarchy absolute, 1660—Des Cartes.

CHAPTER IX.—Of the history of the Dutch republic from the union of Utrecht in the year 1579, to the advancement of the stadtholder to the throne of England, in the year 1689. 185

Union of Utrecht in the year 1579—Synod of Dort, 1618—Independence acknowledged, 1648—The triple alliance, 1668—Invasion of Louis XIV., 1672—The peace of Nimeguen, 1678—The stadtholder king of England, 1689—Erasmus—Grotius—The telescope invented—Dutch school of painting.

CHAPTER X.—Of the history of England, from the accession of Henry VIII. in the year 1509, to that of Mary in the year 1553. 204

Henry VIII. king in the year 1509—The sepremacy of the pope rejected, 1534—The reformation begun, and the lesser monasteries dissolved, 1536—The dissolution of the monasteries completed, 1539—Edward VI. king, 1547.—The liturgy prepared, 1548—The liturgy revised, and the articles of religion prepared, 1552.

CHAPTER XI.—Of the history of England, from the accession of Mary in the year 1553, to that of James I. in the year 1603. 223

PAGE

Mary queen in the year 1553—married to Philip of Spain; origin of the Puritans, 1554—Elizabeth queen, 1558—Oath of supremacy required of members of the house of commons, 1562—Separation of the Puritans begun, 1566—Bull issued against Elizabeth by Pius V., 1570—Another issued by Gregory XIII., 1580—Penal laws enacted against popery, 1585—Mary of Scotland put to death, 1587—The Spanish armada defeated, 1588—The first poor law, 1601—Hooker—Spenser—Shakspeare.

CHAPTER XII.—Of the history of Scotland, from the commencement of the Scotish kingdom in the year 843, to the accession of James VI. to the throne of England in the year 1603 244

Kenneth Mac Alpine king in the year 843 — Saxon colonization, 1097—The first connexion with France, 1168—Scotland dependent on England, 1174—relinquished, 1189—Struggle with England begun, 1290—Representation of towns begun, 1326—Struggle with England concluded, 1372—Representation of barons and freeholders, 1427—English and French parties completely formed, 1520—Mary queen, 1542—The reformation established, 1560—James VI. king, 1567—Mary beheaded, 1587—Presbyterianism established, 1592.

CHAPTER XIII.—Of the history of Ireland, from the commencement of the invasions of the Danes in the year 797, to that of the reign of James I. in the year 1603. 267

First invasion of the Danes in the year 797—Ruin of the Danish power, and of the ancient monarchy of Ireland, 1014—First invasion of the English, 1170—Charter of Ireland, 1216—Parliament assembled, 1295—First effort of independence, 1342—Appellant jurisdiction obtained, 1356 — Independence of the parliament claimed, 1460—Law of Poynings, 1495—Supremacy of the crown enacted, 1536—Henry VIII. entitled king of Ireland, 1541—Edward king, 1547—The English liturgy introduced, 1550—Mary queen, 1553—Elizabeth queen, 1558—Act of uniformity, 1560—Bull of pope Pius V., 1569—Bull of pope Gregory XIII., 1580—Rebellion of the earl of Tyrone, 1595—Reduction of Ireland completed, 1603.

CHAPTER XIV.—Of the history of Great Britain and Ireland, from the accession of James I. in the year 1603, to that of Charles I. in the year 1625 290

James I. king in the year 1603—Hampton-Court-conference, 1604—Gunpowder-plot, 1605—The king declared absolute in Scotland, and the annexation of church-lands dissolved, 1606—Plantation of Ulster in Ireland, 1609—Ecclesiastical power of

PAGE

the bishops in Scotland established, 1610—First general parliament in Ireland, 1613—Calvinistical articles established in Ireland,1615—The Independents, 1616—Articles of Perth, 1618—Protestation of the commons of England, 1621—Bacon.

CHAPTER XV.—Of the history of Great Britain and Ireland, from the accession of Charles I. in the year 1625, to the commencement of the civil war in the year 1642 314

Charles I. king in the year 1625—Petition of Right, 1628—Canons introduced into Scotland, 1636—Liturgy introduced there, 1637—Episcopacy established in Scotland, and the Scotish covenant, 1638—First invasion of the Scots, 1640—Irish rebellion, 1641—Bishops excluded from parliament in England, the civil war begun in England, and general assembly of Roman Catholics in Ireland, 1642.

CHAPTER XVI.—Of the history of Great Britain and Ireland, from the beginning of the civil war in the year 1642, to the restoration in the year 1660 . . . 341

Civil war begun in the year 1642—Solemn league and Covenant, 1643—Second invasion of the Scots, 1644—Westminster-directory and confession, and self-denying ordinance, 1645—Third invasion of the Scots, 1648—Charles condemned and executed, and the house of lords abolished, 1649—Navigation-act, 1652—Ireland and Scotland reduced, 1651—Oliver Cromwell protector, 1653—A united parliament, 1654—Richard Cromwell, protector, 1658—His resignation, 1659—The restoration, 1660—Milton—Dryden.

CHAPTER XVII.—Of the history of Great Britain and Ireland, from the restoration in the year 1660 to the accession of James II. in the year 1685. . . 371

Charles II. restored and feudal tenures abolished, in the year 1660—The corporation-act, 1661—The act of uniformity, and in Ireland the act of settlement, 1662—The act of explanation in Ireland, 1665—The test-act, 1673—The prince of Orange married to the princess Mary, 1677—The Roman Catholics excluded from the parliament, 1678—The parties of Whigs and Tories formed, 1680—The Rye-house plot, 1683.

CHAPTER XVIII.—Of the history of Great Britain and Ireland, from the accession of James II. in the year 1685, to the revolution in the year 1688. 395

James II. king, in the year 1685—Argyle's invasion of Scotland, and Monmouth's invasion of England, in the same year—The revolution, 1688—Flamsteed—Newton—Locke.

PAGE

CHAPTER XIX.—Of the history of France, from the accession of Louis XIII. in the year 1610, to the death of cardinal Mazarin in the year 1661. . . . 419

Louis XIII. king, in the year 1610 — Cardinal Richelieu minister, 1624—The Protestants finally reduced, 1629—Cardinal Mazarin minister, 1642—Louis XIV. king, 1643—War of the *fronde* begun, 1648 — ended, 1652 — The death of cardinal Mazarin, 1661.

CHAPTER XX.—Of the history of France, from the death of cardinal Mazarin in the year 1661, to the first grand alliance, formed against France in the year 1689. . 434

War of the right of devolution, in the year 1667—Triple alliance and peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, 1668—War with the Dutch, 1672—Alliance against France, 1674—Peace of Nimeguen, 1678—Chamber of re-unions, 1680—Liberties of the Gallican church asserted, 1682—Revocation of the edict of Nantes, 1685—League of Augsburg, 1686—First grand alliance, 1689.

CHAPTER XXI.—Of the history of colonisation and commerce, from the commencement of the sixteenth century to the British revolution. . . . 449

The American slave-trade begun in the year 1503—Mexico conquered, 1521—Peru conquered, 1533—Canada settled, 1603—Virginia settled, 1606—Barbadoes settled, 1614—New England settled, 1620—Emigration of the Puritans, 1621—Portuguese dominion in India begun, 1507—The Mogul empire begun, 1526—The Dutch trade begun, 1595—The English company formed, 1600—The Dutch company, 1602—The Dutch settlements begun, 1605—The English factory formed at Surat, 1611—The French trade begun, 1665.

CHAPTER XXII.—Of the histories of Turkey and Persia, from the accession of Solyman I. to the throne of Turkey in the year 1520, to the peace of Constantinople, concluded in the year 1700. 463

Alliance concluded with France by Turkey in the year 1536—Battle of Lepanto fought, 1571—The chief aggrandisement of Persia from 1585 to 1627—Vienna besieged by the Turks and relieved by the Poles, 1633—Persia ceased to maintain an equal struggle with Turkey, 1637—Turkish war of Candia from 1645 to 1669—Peace of Carlowitz concluded by the Turks, 1699—Peace of Constantinople, 1700.

MODERN HISTORY.

BOOK III.

REVIEW OF MODERN HISTORY FROM THE REFORMATION TO THE BRITISH REVOLUTION.

CHAPTER I.

Of the history of Germany and Italy, from the commencement of the reign of Charles V. in the year 1519, *to his abdication in the year* 1556.

The Reformation, which had been begun by Luther in the year 1517, decided by the decree of Worms—Wars with France and Turkey begun, 1521—*Hundred Grievances* of Germany, 1522—The Lutherans begin to associate, 1523—League of the Roman Catholics, 1524—League of the Lutherans: Hungary and Bohemia again acquired by the Austrian family, 1526—Protestation of the Lutherans against the decree of the diet of Spire, and name of Protestants assumed: the Turks besiege Vienna, 1529—Confession of Augsburg: extinction of Italian independence, 1530—Machiavel—Ferdinand, king of the Romans, 1531—League of the Protestants at Smalkalde, 1536—League of the Roman Catholics at Nuremberg, 1538—Order of Jesuits instituted, 1540—Calvin establishes his system at Geneva, 1541—Council of Trent assembled, 1545—Death of Luther: the league of Smalkalde take arms, 1546—The Protestants of Germany league with France, 1551—The Peace of Passau, 1552—The Reformation established in Germany, 1555—Abdication of Charles V., 1556—Pontificate of Leo X.—Ariosto—Tasso—Michael Angelo—Raffael—Galileo—Torricelli.

THE history of the formation of a system of balanced power is divisible into three periods, the Italian, the German, and the French. The Italian period, which[1] has been already

[1] Book ii. chap. i.

considered, was of a very short duration, having been begun by Lorenzo de' Medici in the year 1480, and terminated by his death in the year 1492. The German period, to which the Italian had been preparatory, may be regarded as having commenced with the struggle between the emperor Charles V. and Francis I. of France in the year 1521, and as having extended from that time to the year 1688, when the establishment of William III. on the throne of these countries constituted a new epoch in the policy of Europe. The third period, which arose out of the second, and forms the consummation of this view of history, comprehended the years which intervened between the advancement of William and the revolution of France, or a complete century. The interval between the first and second period was occupied by those Italian struggles, which served to engage the other countries of Europe in the policy of Italy, and to discipline them to the practice of its arrangements. No such interruption, however, was necessary between the second and third, as the latest system was but a new modification of that, by which it had been preceded, and the change was immediately accomplished by the interposition of a new agent, the British government.

The second period, embracing one hundred and sixty-seven years, is the subject of the present book. Of this period, denominated German, because Germany was during that time the predominant country of Europe, and the object of the general apprehension, much the greater part was employed in the slow and gradual formation of the system, which was completed only in the year 1648 by the treaty of Westphalia, or rather in the year 1669 by the treaty of the Hague, the arrangements begun in the negociations of the former having then only been perfected. For the actual subsistence of the system, therefore, only forty, or rather only nineteen years, can be allowed. This would be a short duration indeed, if the period had not been introductory to another, as the Italian period of twelve years had been to the German.

The active principle in the German period of the federative policy of Europe was the mutual opposition of Protestants and Roman Catholics, introduced into its relations by the Reformation. Germany had been prepared for the

formation of a federative system by the loose combination of the parts of its monarchy, which constituted rather a league of distinct states, connected under a common chief, than a single government. It had also acquired from Italy some knowledge and practice of those federal combinations, by which Lorenzo de' Medici had endeavoured to sustain the independence of his native Florence. But these were merely predispositions, and required that some active principle should be introduced, which might array a great combination of states in opposition to some predominant government, and urge them to the most strenuous efforts. Such an opposition of parties was furnished by the separation of a considerable portion of Europe from the communion of the church of Rome. At this period, for the first time, a German historian[2] remarks, princes were enabled to bring foreign politics before their assemblies of states, and hope for a speedy assistance: and the author of a recent French publication has observed[3], that the original principle of the balance of power in Europe, however it was afterwards modified by new circumstances, was nothing but the opposition of the Catholic and Protestant parties. An opposition of religious principles influenced every class, and gave even to every individual a direct and personal interest in the foreign policy of his country.

Many causes had constituted Germany a favourable scene for beginning the Reformation, as for originating that federative policy, to which the religious revolution was thus necessary. The ancient and continued contests between the popes and the emperors had disposed the minds of many to resist the pretensions of the papacy: the degree of success, which had been attained by the pontiffs in the prosecution of their claims, had encouraged them[4] to aggravate the abuses of their dominion, and thus to prepare the people for receiving impressions unfavourable to their religion: and the distribution of the country into numerous jurisdictions,

[2] Schiller's Hist. of the Thirty Years' War, vol. i. p. 9. Dubl, 1800.

[3] Essay on the Reformation, by Villers, p. 270. Lond. 1805.

[4] This is amply proved by the statement of the *centum gravamina*, presented to the pontiff in the year 1523, by the diet of Nuremberg, in which the patrons of the new opinions were far from being the most numerous or powerful party.—Hist. of Charles V., vol. ii. p. 299.

almost independent of the imperial authority, afforded opportunities of protection and safety for the preachers of reformation, which could not exist in a more simple constitution of government. In the most remote part of this country was the electorate of Saxony, a district so considerable, that the imperial crown was offered to the elector by his colleagues in the electoral dignity, who were apprehensive of the power of the two more formidable claimants; and this district was ruled by a prince so wise and moderate, that he refused the proffered diadem, recommending the election of Charles, in preference to Francis. This elector too had recently founded a university at Wittenberg, in which Luther, a monk of the Augustinian order, had been appointed professor, first of philosophy, and afterwards of theology. In a situation so peculiarly favourable to his success, the professor began his career of reformation with opposing the practical abuses of indulgences; and in this his earliest efforts his high character procured for him the support even of the monastic society, to which he belonged, and co-operated with the suggestions of a sound policy in disposing the elector himself to give him protection.

An extraordinary combination of circumstances proved favourable to the beginning and progress of Luther's reformation. The immediate crisis was rendered particularly auspicious by the death of the emperor Maximilian, for that event devolved upon the friendly elector of Saxony[5], the vicariat of that part of the empire, and at the same time diverted the attention of the Roman pontiff from so obscure a contest to the more considerable and pressing interest, which he felt in the election of an emperor. During the interregnum, which lasted more than five months, the opinions of Luther were propagated without control. The Roman pontiff too, having during more than a year afterwards deferred the adoption of decisive measures, gave Luther such an opportunity of examining the proceedings and principles of the court of Rome, as determined him to undertake a reformation, not only of practice, but also of doctrine; and[6] when at length he was condemned by a decree of the empire, the

[5] Hist. of Charles V., vol. ii. p. 135. The elector palatine and the elector of Saxony were the ordinary vicars of the empire. [6] Ibid., p. 180.

execution of the decree was hindered, partly by the multiplicity of occupation, in which the commotions of Spain, and the wars of Italy and the Netherlands, involved and embarrassed the emperor, partly by the singular precaution of his friend the elector of Saxony, who caused him to be carried into captivity, and detained in an unknown confinement. The circumstances of his own mind also were not less favourable, for to the gradual progress of his religious discoveries he owed his success; his hearers were imperceptibly carried forward from one step to another, and the Roman pontiff was restrained from resorting at once to measures of severity, which might have stifled the Reformation in its birth[7].

It is natural to enquire, why the emperor was not influenced by the same considerations, which disposed the elector of Saxony to be the protector of Luther, even before he became his disciple. As emperor of Germany he was the political rival of the Roman pontiff, and he must have felt more deeply, in proportion to his more extended authority, the grievances of ecclesiastical usurpation. Why then did not the German Reformation comprehend the whole territory of the empire, like the change of religion effected in the northern kingdoms of Denmark and Sweden, instead of being limited to certain provinces, and disowned by the sovereign? The answer to the question[8] has been already given by the historian, in remarking that the various and scattered dominions of Charles, and the impending hostilities of Francis, rendered it indispensably important to him to secure the friendship of the pontiff. A most extraordinary concurrence of contingencies had united in his person the successions of Austria, the Netherlands, and Spain, so that he could not consider the question of a reformation merely as the sovereign of the empire, and for his other dominions he could not hazard the enterprise.

Another enquiry here presents itself, which belongs to the present investigation. How would the general interests of Europe have been affected, if Charles had not by a double inheritance become the sovereign of these various and scattered dominions, but, possessing only the empire, had adopted the principles of the Saxon elector, and supported Luther in

[7] Hist. of Charles V., vol. ii. p. 144. [8] Ibid., p. 176.

separating from the Roman see? This question may be answered from the consideration of the importance of the mutual opposition of Protestants and Roman Catholics, as the generating principle of a system of political equilibrium, begun within the government of Germany. If the whole empire had become protestant, there would have been within it no such division of religious parties, as appears to have been required for giving being to the struggles, which were concluded by the adjustments of the treaty of Westphalia.

It may indeed be questioned, whether the Reformation could, in a religious view, have been well established in Germany, if it had not experienced from the power of the emperor a resistance, which restrained its leaders within the bounds of moderation. Melancthon has on more than one occasion[9] expressed his apprehension of the violence, which the clergy would probably suffer from the princes, and yet more from the nobles, bred as these had been in forests and stables, if they were not restrained by the hierarchy and the emperor; and he has declared his persuasion, that the two great chiefs of the Protestants would probably have contended among themselves, and that many divisions would have ensued among their followers. The interest of religion was therefore coincident with the political interest of Europe, both being most effectually promoted by the adherence of the emperor to the see of Rome.

The character of Luther was singularly compounded of a fearless courage in conduct, and a cautious and even diffident timidity of opinion. Driven[10] early into the monastic life by the shock experienced at the sudden death of a friend, killed by lightning at his side, he appears to have been disciplined by it to habits of patient submission, while his native boldness bade defiance to personal danger. In that situation also he found various excitements of a purer faith. The monastery, in which he sought a retreat, being of the Augustinian order, he naturally acquired a respect for the writings of Augustin, which were adverse to the actual state of the church: in the second year after he had entered it, he discovered a Latin bible, and then for the first time learned that there were other passages of scripture, besides those which were recited in the daily offices of the church: soon

[9] Schmidt, tom. vii. p. 488. [10] Seckendorf, lib. i. pp. 18, 19.

afterwards, being visited in sickness by an aged monk, he received from him the doctrine of the remission of sins through faith, and was from that time indefatigable in searching the sacred scriptures and the works of the patron of his order. Still he had no idea of questioning the faith of the church of Rome, and seven years elapsed before he was, as he has himself represented, forced into an open opposition by the impossibility of retreating[11]. Slowly and with difficulty did he emancipate himself from the persuasion, that he was bound to submit his opinions to the dictation of the visible church. This persuasion was however[12] much shaken by a mission, on which he had been dispatched to Rome for the determination of some disputed matters of discipline relative to his order, for he had in the ecclesiastical capital of Christendom[13] been disgusted by the abandoned morals and the irreligion of the clergy, though he could not yet cease to consider them as the rulers of his faith. Luther has been censured as coarse and violent, when he was at length engaged in the great struggle of the Reformation; but with more moderation he could not have held on his way through the difficulties, which opposed him[14], and with all his violence he was most adverse to the principle of maintaining by arms the cause of religious truth[15].

[11] Seckendorf, lib. i. p. 38. [12] Bower's Life of Luther, pp. 20, 21. Lond. 1813. [13] He used often afterwards to exclaim that he would not, for the value of a thousand florins, have missed the instruction afforded him by the journey to Rome.—Ibid., p. 21. It is remarkable that Wicliffe had the advantage of receiving a similar lesson.

[14] Luther in a confidential letter writes thus of himself:—Solor tamen meipsum, quod existimem, imo sciam, patrem illum familias cœlestem, pro magnitudine suæ domûs, etiam opus habere uno et altero servo, *duro contra duros, et aspero contra asperos*, veluti malo cuneo in malos nodos.—Epist. Lutheri, ed. Budd., p. 193. Erasmus applied to him a commendation, assigned by the ancient proverb to Hercules, Cimon, and other illustrious characters, ἄκομψος μὲν, ἀλλὰ τὰ μέγιστα ἀγαθὸς. —Melancthon's Funeral Oration. [15] Before the meeting held at Smalkalde, the elector of Saxony demanded of Luther, whether it were lawful to form a league for the defence of religion. The reply of Luther was, that he could not advise an alliance, and would rather die ten times, than cause that a war should be excited for the gospel.—Seckendorf, lib. ii. p. 141. Two years afterwards, however, he yielded to the suggestion, that the emperor had so abused his constitutional powers, that the states were justified by the constitution of the empire in entering into a defensive alliance for the protection of that religious truth, which they were bound to preserve to their subjects.—Ibid., lib. iii. p. 10.

The occasion of the Reformation, it is well known, was furnished by the gross aggravation of the indulgences of the church, which had been early in their origin, though slow and gradual in the progress to their last prodigious enormity. In their commencement indulgences[16] were merely mitigations of the penances imposed by the church, conceded to the recommendations of martyrs and confessors. They were however so speedily abused, that early in the third century, Tertullian complained of the fraudulent contrivances, by which the discipline of the church was already evaded. But the practice was not very widely extended, nor employed as an engine of power, until the crusades had excited the pontiffs to employ every expedient for collecting a force sufficient to encounter their infidel adversaries. The crusaders being considered as men engaged in the immediate service of the church, it was deemed reasonable that they should be encouraged in their arduous and hazardous enterprise by a plenary indulgence, extended to a remission of all sins, and the boon was afterwards granted to all, who without engaging personally in the service, should provide substitutes for these wars of religion. The indulgences, thus granted to those who opposed the infidels of the east, were afterwards allowed to them, who encountered the domestic enemies of the church, the heretics of the west: the institution of jubilees, the first of which was celebrated in the year 1300, converted them into an expedient for supporting and enriching the see of Rome, indulgences being granted to all, who should on such occasions repair to the papal residence: and the accelerated return of these festivals, the interval being successively reduced from a hundred[17] to fifty, to thirty-three and to twenty-five years, so multiplied the distribution of these favours of the papacy, that it became an ordinary measure of ecclesiastical finance. Originally, they had been issued by the bishops; but at the commencement of the crusades, the power was claimed by the pontiffs as the exclusive prerogative of the Roman see, at which

[16] Hist. of the Reformation, by Beausobre, vol. i. p. 8. Lond. 1801.

[17] There is extant an edict of Clement VI., who reduced the interval to fifty years, in which he charges the angels to transport to heaven those who should die in this pilgrimage.—Sleidani Comment., p. 620. Francof. 1610.

time the plenitude of the papal power transformed them from remissions of ecclesiastical penances into remissions of the pains of purgatory. In support of this pretension it was urged, that the superabundant merit of the saints constituted a stock, from which the pontiff could at pleasure transfer portions to sinners. As the sufficiency of this stock might be questioned, the infinite merits of Christ were added to those of the saints; but, as[18] it was not easy to persuade mankind, that the free gift of Christ could be purchased with money, the chief reliance was placed on the satisfaction of the saints. Penance was mentioned for the sake of form; money however, was alone required, or at the most some external performances, which it was even then permitted to redeem.

Offensive to every moral and religious feeling as the abuse of indulgences had already become, it was aggravated by Leo X., who had been advanced to the papacy in the year 1513. Splendid in his expenditure, he soon discovered that his finances were inadequate to the supply of his wants, especially as he was charged with the task of completing the great church of saint Peter, which his predecessor had begun to build. To proclaim a sale of indulgences, was on this occasion suggested to him, as the easiest and most effectual expedient for replenishing the exhausted coffers of the papacy; and it was accordingly published in the year 1516, the sale being urged, especially in Saxony, with an eagerness which disregarded and outraged every principle of religion, and every feeling of decorum. So destitute of shame was Tetzel, the papal agent, that a German bishop declared his persuasion, that this would be the last vender of such a commodity[19]. Absolution was given for future sins, equally as for the past, and thus indulgences were converted into licences for violating the commands of God.

This was not an incidental abuse, which might provoke the censure of the pious, while the general system of the prevailing religion was still sound and defensible, for the question of indulgences involved the consideration of human salvation, and therefore concerned the most essential principle of the religion of Christ. A question of no less importance was at issue, than whether salvation could be pur-

[18] Beausobre, vol. i. pp. 13, 14. [19] Ibid., pp. 33, 34.

chased with money. On the thirty-first day of October, in the year 1517, ninety-five propositions were offered by Luther on this subject for discussion, and the Reformation was begun. In exercising the function of a confessor[20], he had thought it necessary to enjoin certain penances for some atrocious crimes; the persons, on whom they were imposed, pleaded that they had already received remission in the form of an indulgence; and the future reformer, disregarding the protection, refused the absolution, for which they had solicited him, until they should have complied with his direction. The persons thus rejected complained to Tetzel, who was then in a neighbouring town; and he menaced the despisers of indulgences with the terrors of the Inquisition, causing a pile to be several times formed in the market-place. Luther, when he had in vain made application to some bishops for satisfaction and protection[21], determined to appeal to the reason of his countrymen, by proposing questions to be agitated before the university of Wittenberg, in which he was the professor of theology.

To Luther was opposed a pontiff, who appears to have regarded his efforts with the calmness of a man devoted much more to the consideration of the political interests of Italy, and to the enjoyments of literature and the arts, than to the duties and the cares of his ecclesiastical station. The biographer of Leo X.[22] has laboured to palliate the ecclesiastical deficiencies of his character; but the efforts of Mr. Roscoe can avail little against the observation of Paolo, that he would have been a perfect pontiff, if to his other qualities he had added 'some knowledge in matters of religion, and a greater inclination to piety, to neither of which he appeared to pay any great attention.' Pallavicini also, the adversary of Paolo, concurs in the representation of the latter, describing the pontiff as neglecting to cultivate that sacred literature which became his station; as calling even into the sanctuary of religion those who were better ac-

[20] Seckendorf, lib. i. p. 17. [21] Luther has been accused of opposing indulgences merely because the Augustinian friars were jealous of the preference which had been given to the Dominicans, in employing these as the agents of the traffic; but the imputation, which had been adopted by Hume, has been refuted by the translator of Mosheim's history, vol. iv. p. 31, note. [22] Roscoe's Life of Leo X., vol. iv. pp. 320, &c. Liverpool, 1805.

quainted with the fables of Greece and the delights of poetry, than with the history and doctrines of the church; and as giving such attention to the chase, to amusements, and to pompous exhibitions, as was manifestly inconsistent with the gravity, which he was bound to maintain in his ecclesiastical presidency. Though the biographer has deemed himself justified in rejecting, because resting only on the authority of Luther, a story brought to prove the impiety and atheism of the pontiff[23], yet it may at least be considered as illustrating the opinion generally entertained of his indifference in regard to religion, and it agrees well with the testimonies of many authors, who have referred to his character[24]. When we consider what might have been the difficulties of the reformers, if they had been encountered by the unconquerable zeal of a Gregory VII., or by the daring ambition of an Innocent III., we may appreciate the advantage, which their cause derived from the pontificate of an indifferent, perhaps an infidel voluptuary[25].

While Luther was gradually advancing in the propagation of a purer faith, he found his way prepared by the writings of a scholar, who had not hardihood sufficient to enable him to embrace his cause. Erasmus, the modern Lucian, ridiculed the monastic orders of the church and the court of Rome itself[26], and by weakening their influence

[23] Luther tells us that Leo, having listened to a disputation concerning the immortality of the soul, pronounced this judgment:—Tu quidem vera videris dicere, sed adversarii tui oratio facit bonum vultum, id est, lætiorem mentem (Ital. buona cera), ex Epicuri scilicet sententiâ.—Seckendorf, lib. iii. p. 676. [24] 'On a time when cardinal Bembus did move a question out of the gospell, the pope gave him a very contemptuous answere, saying all ages can testifye enough how profitable that fable of Christe hath been to us and our companie.'—Bale's Pageant of the Popes, p. 179, ed. 1574, quoted by Mr. Roscoe, Life of Leo X., vol. iv. p. 328. The following epigram was written by Sannazarro, in allusion to the circumstances of the death of this pontiff:—

Sacra sub extremâ si forte requiritis horâ
Cur Leo non potuit sumere; vendiderat.

Greswell's Mem. of Politianus, &c. p. 385. [25] Leo did not proceed to condemn the tenets of Luther until the year 1520, when he was overcome by importunity.—Mosheim, vol. iv. p. 50. [26] The design of his little treatise on the praise of folly was to express his resentment of the neglect which he had experienced at Rome; and therefore he exposed that court, not sparing the pope himself: on which account

assisted the Reformation. The Dutch scholar had afforded it a more direct assistance by publishing[27] the first edition of the New Testament in the original language, the date of which preceded just by one year the commencement of Luther's opposition to indulgences. His paraphrases also were so much esteemed even among Protestants, that in the beginning of the reign of Edward VI., of England, it was ordered that this book, which had been translated into the English language, should be placed, together with the Bible, in the church of every parish[28]. It has been accordingly said of this eminent and agreeable writer, that 'he had laid the egg which Luther hatched[29].' He was far, however, from possessing either the views or the spirit of the reformer. Instead of admiring Augustin, from whom Luther had derived his doctrine of faith, Erasmus[30] attached himself to the study of Jerome; and he has not hesitated to declare[31], that he had not the courage necessary for becoming a martyr to the truth, but was ready through prudence to submit to the decisions of the pope and the emperor, even when he knew them to be wrong. The hope of Erasmus[32] was, that a reformation of literature would gradually and quietly generate a reformation of religion, for which he was

he was never after looked upon as a true son of that church.—Jortin's Life of Erasmus, vol. i. p. 31. London, 1808. [27] The Complutensian edition of the New Testament by cardinal Ximenes had been completed two years before, but was not published until the year 1522, so that it could not have reached Erasmus, until he had published his third edition. The cardinal first delayed his publication until the whole Bible had been printed, which was accomplished in the year 1517; the pontiff then interposed his prohibition, which was not removed until the year 1520; and some other difficulties afterwards caused an additional delay of two years.—Wettstein, Proleg., p. 120. Amst. 1751. [28] Burnet's Hist. of the Reformation, vol. ii. p. 26. Lond. 1715. [29] 'This,' says Erasmus, 'is a joke of the Minorite brethren, for which they deserve to be complimented as wits: but I laid a hen-egg, and Luther has hatched a very different bird.'—Jortin's Life of Erasmus, vol. i. p. 320. [30] 'As much,' says Luther, 'as Erasmus prefers Jerome to Augustin, so much do I prefer Augustin to Jerome.'—Ibid., p. 86. 'I know none among the teachers,' he also says, 'whom I hate like him (Jerome); for he writeth only of fasting, of victuals, of virginity, &c.; he teacheth nothing of faith, nor of hope, nor of love, nor of the works of faith. Truly I would not have willingly entertained him for my chaplain.'—Ibid., p. 114.

[31] Jortin's Life of Erasmus, vol. i. pp. 250, 251. [32] Ibid., p. 254.

contented to wait. He was not however permitted to wait in tranquillity, for he was driven by the jealousy of the church of Rome into a controversy with the reformer[33]; but he chose for his subject a question of metaphysical philosophy, rather than of theology, attacking his adversary only on the question of liberty and necessity, and abstaining at the same time from every expression of malignant opposition[34]. Nor was this pretended hostility destitute of an influence favourable to the Reformation, for it taught the followers of Luther to moderate their religious opinions, so far as they were connected with the scholastic question.

With the primary reformer of Germany was very curiously associated, as if to correct his vehemence, and to give him the aid of more extensive learning, the moderate and learned Melancthon, whose mildness so conciliated the general good-will, that, as Erasmus remarked[35], even his adversaries could not hate him, and whose learning rendered him so respectable, that, as Seckendorf has informed us, the eulogies pronounced upon him by learned men would fill a very large volume. Melancthon did not possess the firmness necessary for the leader of the Reformation, for on two occasions he had the weakness[36] to concede most of the

[33] Jortin's Life of Erasmus, vol. i. p. 313. Erasmus was much offended at being called 'the Balaam of the Reformation, hired to curse Israel.' The correspondence appears to have been maintained in the result, for the feebleness of his opposition is supposed to have 'put him away from honours,' the dignity of a cardinal, to which he aspired.

[34] The elector of Saxony, when Charles V. had been recently advanced to the empire, desired Erasmus freely to give him his opinion concerning Luther. Erasmus, says Spalatinus, who was present, pressing his lips close together, stood musing, and delaying to give an answer, while Frederic, as was his way when he was discoursing earnestly with any one, fixed his eyes steadily upon him, and stared him full in the face. At last Erasmus broke out into these words:—Luther hath been guilty of two crimes; he hath touched the pope upon the crown, and the monks upon the belly.—Jortin's Life of Erasmus, vol. i. p. 226.

[35] Cox's Life of Melancthon, p. 22.

[36] His weakness was shown first in a timorous defence of the confession of Augsburg, in which he admitted the doctrine of transubstantiation: afterwards in a disposition to accede to the system of regulations, proposed by the emperor, which was distinguished by the name of the *Interim*. In the latter instance, alleging that in things indifferent compliance was due to the imperial mandate, he professed to regard as such the doctrine of justification by faith alone, the ne-

principles, for which he had previously contended; but his mildness and his learning were most useful auxiliaries to the bold and honest vehemence of the intrepid Luther, who[37] ranked his *Loci Communes* next to the sacred scriptures for religious instruction, and considered them as sufficient, with the scriptures, for supplying a complete knowledge of divinity. In this manner were genius and learning and conciliation united in the cause of the Reformation with the more strenuous qualities of the great reformer; and most happily were they exercised in preparing the confession of Augsburg, the declaration of the faith of the Lutherans, of which Luther furnished the substance, but the exposition was the work of Melancthon.

Unlike the yielding Melancthon, Luther[38] refused a compromise of opinion, which would have broken down the wall of separation between the German and the Helvetic church, and thus have deprived Europe of the results, which arose from their distinct and appropriate characters. But while with impetuous, and unsparing energy he reprobated the practices and opinions of the church of Rome, and with an inflexible rigour of doctrinal severity proscribed the peculiar opinions of other reformers, he manifested a truly Christian moderation in the zeal, with which he laboured to restrain the excesses ocasioned[39], or at least countenanced, by the

cessity of good works to eternal salvation, the number of the sacraments, the jurisdiction claimed by the pope and the bishops, extreme unction, the observation of certain religious festivals, and several superstitious rites and ceremonies.—Mosh., vol. iv. p. 283, note by the translator.—Ibid., pp. 326, 327. [37] Cox's Life of Melancthon, p. 189. [38] Bucer laboured to unite the Helvetic church with that of Luther, by proposing certain modifications of the doctrine of Zuingle in regard to the eucharist; but in the year 1544 Luther published his confession of faith in regard to this doctrine, which put an end to all hopes of union.—Cox's Life of Melancthon, pp. 365, 366. [39] These excesses were wrought by the Anabaptists, who were not satisfied with the reformation of Luther, thinking it not sufficiently spiritual, and expecting that a visible church should be formed, which should consist only of saints. Perceiving that they did not gain proselytes with sufficient rapidity by their exhortations and pretended revelations, they began in the year 1525 to endeavour to propagate their doctrine by arms. In this struggle they possessed themselves of the city of Munster in Westphalia, which they proposed to constitute the capital of the

first movements of reformation. His exemplary disinterestedness he evinced, by remaining in the same academic situation, in which he had first proclaimed his opposition to the indulgences of Rome. Roused to this opposition by no vain arrogance of speculation, but by the honest indignation of a virtuous heart, he sought for truth in the records of revelation, and slowly and gradually emancipated himself from the errors[40], in which he had been educated. What he thus discovered to be the truth he maintained with a fearless defiance of the terrors of the world. Coarse in his invectives, as was the fashion of his age, he was as ardent and intrepid in supporting his opinions, as he had been slow and cautious in forming them. To his avowed disapprobation of violence in the defence of truth and religion the time of his death bore a remarkable correspondence, for he was removed from the world in the same year, in which the confederated Protestants judged it necessary to have recourse to arms. He had performed the duty, for which he was peculiarly qualified by his principles and feelings; and the cause of his followers was then committed to the ordinary operations of political agents.

new kingdom of Christ, indulging themselves at the same time in the most flagitious extravagances; but the city was retaken in the year 1536, and the violences of the fanatics were effectually repressed.—Mosheim, cent. xvi. sect. 3, part 2, ch. 3.

[40] In a letter, addressed to the bishop of Brandenburg in the year 1518, he says, concerning the theses, which he had in the preceding year proposed for disputation, that of the accuracy of some of them he was himself doubtful, and of several he was ignorant; and yet in these very theses he had admitted the reality of purgatory, and of the divine inspiration of the pope, with much of his claim of power.—Bower's Life of Luther, pp. 47—58. The supremacy of the Roman see he first questioned in the year 1519; and towards the end of the same year he first professed without reserve his dissent from the church of Rome in regard to the sacrament of the Lord's supper.—Ibid., pp. 108, 119. The repeated attacks of his opponents obliged him, he said, to grow wiser in self-defence.—Ibid., p. 118. Even in the year 1523 he still retained an attachment to several of the superstitious customs of the church of Rome, and, in particular, was not prepared for the abolition of the public mass, though on account of abuses he consented to that of the private celebration.—Ibid., p. 189. It is remarkable that in the year 1522 he declared, that all his tenets had been anticipated by Wesselus, surnamed Gansevoit, a native of Groningen, who had died in the year 1489, but that he had himself then for the first time seen his treatise, which was first published in that year.—Seckendorf, lib. i. p. 226.

The success of the German Reformation appears to have been very remarkably assisted by the whole series of the events of the reign of Charles, which preceded the death of Luther and the commencement of hostilities between the two parties. The war kindled by the emulation of Charles and Francis[41] left Germany in a profound tranquillity, which permitted it to make an unobstructed and rapid progress. The alliance[42] which the Roman pontiff, Clement VII., had formed with the king of France, gave occasion to dissensions[43] between him and the emperor, which not only added to the embarrassments of the latter, but rendered him averse from measures unfriendly to the Reformation, and even induced him to publish an appeal to a general council. When at length, in concluding a peace in the year 1529, he deemed it necessary to the support of his authority, that he should declare himself the protector of the ancient and established religion, the result[44] of this measure was that the Protestants[45] became associated by the league of Smalkalde. The speedy renewal of foreign war then again favoured the reformers, and by the treaty of Nuremberg[46], concluded in the year 1531, the emperor granted conditions almost amounting to a toleration.

In the progress of this great struggle incidents occurred, remarkably resembling those, which the imagination has devised, for giving a deeper interest to fictitious narrative. What incident in romantic story can be considered as more remote from the ordinary course of events, than that the reformer should have been rescued from imminent danger by

[41] Hist. of Charles V., vol. ii. p. 292. [42] Ibid. pp. 411, 412.

[43] In the course of these dissensions Rome was taken and plundered by the imperialists; but the emperor, when he had been reconciled with the pope, was so solicitous to make reparation, that he granted more favourable terms, than any which could have been expected after a series of successes.—Ibid., vol. iii. p. 31. [44] Ibid., vol. ii. p. 54. [45] This denomination was derived from the *protest*, which was entered against the intolerant decree of a diet convened in the year 1529. It was subscribed by the electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, the two dukes of Lunenburg, the landgrave of Hesse, and the prince of Anhalt, together with fourteen considerable towns, namely, Strasburg, Nuremberg, Ulm, Constance, Reutlengen, Windsheim, Meinengen, Lindaw, Kempten, Hailbron, Isna, Weissemburg, Nordlingen, and St. Gal.—Sleidani Comm., pp. 158, 160. [46] Hist. of Charles V., vol. iii. pp. 61, 62.

the interposition of an unseen protector, who hurried him into an obscure captivity in a castle surrounded by a forest, where, under an assumed name, his real character not being known even to his guards, he was preserved until the violence of persecution had abated, and in the interval found that leisure for translating the scriptures[47], which his zeal in discharging the duties of his ministry would not otherwise have allowed? We observe also that the history of the reformation of Germany, in the same correspondence to our works of imagination, exhibited, just before the completion of that most important revolution, such a disastrous vicissitude of fortune[48], as that into which the hero of a fictitious narrative is commonly plunged, immediately before he is represented as attaining to distinction and happiness. When the cause of the reformation had during twenty-seven years advanced in a steady course towards a successful establishment, it was then arrested in its progress, which seemed to be for ever barred; but suddenly the way was again opened before it, and the goal was almost immediately reached.

Thirteen years after the treaty of Nuremberg[49] a peace was again concluded between Charles and Francis, the emperor being chiefly induced by his anxious desire of repressing by arms the Protestants, who had at this time assumed the form of a dangerous association. In this enterprise the emperor was at first flattered by appearances of decisive success. The disunion and imprudence of the confederates soon reduced almost the whole body to an unquali-

[47] The translation of the New Testament was published in the year 1522, and the publication of a version of the whole Bible was completed in the year 1530. Sleidan says of Luther, that he both greatly adorned and enriched the German language, and holds the first rank among its writers, employing the most expressive and appropriate words, and translating from the Latin language phrases, which seemed to be incapable of a German version.—Comm., p. 452. [48] This is such a revolution, as has been described by the great critic of antiquity, when treating of tragedy: 'a change into the reverse of what is expected from the circumstances of the action; and that produced by probable, or necessary consequence.'—Twining's Aristotle on Poetry, p. 84. Lond., 1789. In romantic narrative however the revolution of fortune is commonly the reverse of that, which is employed to deepen by contrast the distress of the disastrous catastrophe of tragedy.

[49] Hist. of Charles V., vol. iii. pp. 302, 305.

fied submission, the single city of Magdeburg alone continuing to resist the emperor. The death of Francis, which occurred in the following year, seemed to complete his assurance of triumph, as it removed the rival, who had long embarrassed his measures. This alarming depression of the Protestants proved however to be on the contrary the very crisis of their full and legal establishment. The emperor, intoxicated with his success in repressing their league[50], proceeded to endeavour at once to enforce by his authority a uniformity of religious opinions, and to exalt that authority above all opposition. A protestant prince of Saxony[51], who with a selfish policy had attached himself to him, though probably in a mistaken reliance on his promises, was at once prompted and enabled by that very conduct, so hostile to the immediate interests of the confederates, to insure in the end their effectual resistance. This politic prince, who had by the favour of Charles added to his hereditary possession of one part of Saxony the electorate of that province, of which his cousin had been deprived, and had thus become the most powerful prince of Germany, embraced a critical moment for declaring himself the protector of the liberties of Germany, and extending his view beyond the limits of the empire, effected with France a confederacy, which had been projected by the Protestants when they confederated at Smalkalde. Unable to resist a combination so powerful, or to repeat the artifices, which had ruined the former confederacy, the emperor yielded to the necessity of his situation. The treaty of Passau, which provisionally established the Lutheran church of Germany on a legal basis[52], and relinquished the political usurpations

[50] Hist. of Charles V., vol. iv. p. 25. [51] Ibid. vol. iii. pp. 332, &c., vol. iv. p. 11. [52] This establishment was limited to the Lutherans. A restrictive clause, named the Ecclesiastical Reservation, was also annexed by the imperial authority, depriving of his benefice every ecclesiastic, who should after that time become a Lutheran.—Pfeffel, tome ii. p. 174. The Calvinists were however admitted into the empire a few years afterwards, the emperor Ferdinand being probably induced by the pope to acquiesce in it, that it might weaken the union of the Protestants. The elector palatine was the first prince, who embraced the doctrine of Calvin, and caused it to be adopted by his subjects.—Ibid., p. 190. The state of the Calvinists was notwithstanding precarious until the year 1648, when by the treaty of Westphalia they were placed in the same condition with the Lutherans.—Ibid., p. 202.

of the emperor, was accordingly concluded in the year 1552, and three years afterwards the transaction was formally completed in a diet assembled at Augsburg.

The Protestants of Germany[53] had from the beginning of their association looked for support to Francis, the rival of their sovereign. The French king was however hindered from promising his protection, not only by a peace recently concluded at his own desire, but also by the exhausted state of his resources. An alliance indeed, if then concluded, must have been afterwards dissolved by the persecutions, with which that prince harassed his own protestant subjects, for, when he had become desirous of gaining the assistance of the Protestants of Germany[54], he found that he had thereby placed an insuperable barrier in the way. In the last great struggle of the German Protestants[55] the sense of danger overcame the difficulty, and an alliance was concluded in the year 1551, which formed the basis of the adjustment of the federative arrangements of Europe, as it was almost a century afterwards constituted by the treaty of Westphalia. Here then we perceive the bearing of the temporary depression of the Protestants. That alone could have effected the original combination of the balanced policy of Europe. The story of the German reformation bears upon it the distinctive character of the divine foreknowledge, in its prospective relation to a transaction then a century distant.

Perhaps no more remarkable example of a hostile power acting upon the interior interests of a nation could be produced, than that which is afforded by the aggressions of the Turks, as they in the reign of Charles V. influenced those of the empire. The Turkish dominion had been completed by the acquisition of Syria and Egypt just two years before that prince was advanced to the imperial throne, and was therefore prepared to act upon the empire with its utmost force, when those great interests began to be agitated in it, on which such an agency might be exercised with the greatest effect. We accordingly observe the Turkish war connecting itself with all the fortunes of the German Protestants, and also determining that disposition of the imperial

[53] Hist. of Charles V., vol. iii. p. 55. [54] Ibid., p. 267. [55] Ibid., p. 361; vol. iv. p. 59.

government, by which it was after the death of Charles separated from the crown of Spain.

The war of Turkey began with the struggle of the German reformation, for in the year 1521, Luther was proscribed by the diet of Worms, and about the same time the Turks attacked Louis, king of Bohemia[56], and gained possession of Belgrade, the bulwark of Christendom. In the year 1532, the emperor for the first time consented to conclude a peace of religion[57], because the Turks in that year menaced Austria with invasion. The Protestants, who under the protection of these hostilities had acquired strength and importance, were afterwards abandoned to their own exertions, for Solyman in the year 1547 was induced to turn his arms against Persia[58], which has been described as the political counterpoise of the Ottoman government[59]; and they were accordingly so reduced by the power of the emperor, that they submitted to accept, under an ordinance denominated the *Interim*, a restoration of almost all the abuses, which they had renounced[60]. But this was the crisis of the German reformation, which has been already noticed; and the issue of it was the legal establishment of the church of the Lutherans, completed after eight years by the diet of Augsburg.

The apprehension of the same people has been mentioned, as reinforcing the arguments of expediency for electing in the year 1531 the archduke Ferdinand, brother of Charles V., to the dignity of king of the Romans, by which appointment he acquired a right of succession to the imperial dignity. The primary motive was the necessity of providing for the government of the empire during the long intervals, in which Charles was obliged to attend personally to the concerns of his hereditary dominions[61]. The Roman Catholic electors were probably disposed to favour Ferdinand, through an apprehension that the elector of Saxony, who must otherwise have been nominated vicar of the empire, might avail

[56] Sleidani Comm., p. 64. [57] Ibid., p. 210. [58] Cantimir, tome ii. p. 326. [59] Book ii. ch. xi. [60] This was a system of religion published by the emperor in the year 1548, when the council assembled at Trent had been transferred to Bologna. It was so named because the people of Germany were required to adhere to it in the interval, which should be interposed between that time and the restoration of the council. [61] Pfeffell, tome ii. p. 142.

himself of his delegated power to favour more effectually the cause of the Lutherans; but the fear of the Turks might operate upon all to overcome their repugnance to a measure, which, though not unprecedented, was contrary to the principle of a government professedly elective[62]. When Ferdinand was elected king of the Romans, Philip the son of Charles, was but four years old, and was therefore unfit to be offered to the choice of the electors. The emperor was afterwards desirous of securing to his son the succession of the imperial crown, together with that of his Spanish dominions; but the appointment previously made presented an insurmountable obstacle, for Ferdinand could not be induced to resign his dignity.

The temporary combination of the huge and scattered dominions of Charles had produced important effects, in engaging France in a struggle with a power alarming to its independence, in favouring the efforts of the reformers by the distractions and absences of the sovereign, and in binding at the same time that sovereign to the support of the existing system of religion. It was however important to the subsequent interest of Europe, that this combination should be dissolved, as soon as these effects had been produced; and the Turkish hostilities, by facilitating, perhaps by suggesting, the advancement of the brother of the emperor to the second dignity of the empire, made preparation for effecting the separation without a struggle.

In the year following that, in which Luther had protested against the sale of indulgences in Germany, the same abuse was not less strenuously resisted by Zuingle in Swisserland. The reformer of that country had indeed so early as in the year 1516, begun to instruct his hearers from the sacred scriptures, though without directly condemning the church of Rome[63]. His situation, in an obscure district of a free country, did not require the same slow advances, which were necessary in the more exposed situation of the German re-

[62] Such an appointment had been usual in ancient times, and was indeed coeval with the transfer of the imperial dignity to the German princes.—Ibid., tome i. p. 127. It afterwards became less frequent, as the imperial power was reduced; but an instance had occurred so late as in the year 1486, when Maximilian, the grandfather and immediate predecessor of Charles V. was so elected.—Ibid., tome ii. p. 50.

[63] Hist. de la Réform. de la Suisse, par Ruchat, tome i. p. 6. Genève, 1727.

former. We accordingly perceive that his mind had been previously opened to the truth, and was thus prepared for encountering the abuses of Rome, instead of being roused by the offensiveness of these abuses to combat the doctrines of a church, in which they were maintained. The difference too of their personal conditions corresponded to that of their local situations. Luther was a monk, and consequently disciplined to habits of submission; but Zuingle was a parochial minister, living at large in society, and left free to the workings of his own reflections.

The Helvetic reformation, thus commenced by Zuingle, was completed twenty-three years afterwards, or in the year 1541, by Calvin at Geneva. Mosheim has remarked that, without the efforts of this second founder[64], the Helvetic church would probably have been confined within the limits of Swisserland, being indebted to his extraordinary talents and extensive views for a celebrity and influence, which it could not otherwise have acquired. The little community in which he established his system, had been prepared for his purpose, the great contest between Francis and Charles having six years before given occasion to a revolt, by which it became independent both of the duke of Savoy, and of its own bishop. It was in itself singularly accommodated to the reception and propagation of such a system. The state of Geneva was so small, that the ecclesiastical revolution predominated in all its concerns, and gave it almost exclusively the character of an ecclesiastical community; and being near the frontier of France, yet sheltered by its participation of the independence of the Swiss confederacy[65], this diminutive republic was able to communicate an important influence to the neighbouring monarchy, without being absorbed into its greatness. Nor was Calvin less fitted by circumstances to be the framer of a system, which might thus be extended to the adjacent country, being a native of France, where also he had received his education, though driven by the violence of persecution to seek a refuge among the Protestants of Germany and Swisserland[66].

[64] Eccles. Hist., vol. iv. p. 372. [65] For protection against the attacks of the Duke of Savoy, the citizens of Geneva had in the year 1526 formed a permanent alliance with the cantons of Berne and Friburg.—Planta, vol. ii. p. 136. [66] Francis I., incensed by some wri-

The twofold character of the reformation appears to have provided more effectually for the formation and support of a just system of religion, than could have been accomplished by any single effort. The system of Luther, in its very inconsiderable deviation from the Roman doctrine of the eucharist, bore the timid character of that monastic obedience, in which the habits of its author, vehement as he was by nature, had been formed to submission, while the bold dictation of Calvin, though he professed to sacrifice all his opinions and feelings to an implicit acknowledgment of scriptural truth, discovered the independent spirit of a man educated to the secular profession of the law, and loose from all the engagements of ecclesiastical subordination. If Luther alone had planned the reformation, it would have departed too little from the tenets of the church of Rome; if Calvin had been its only leader, it would have dogmatised too boldly on the counsels of the Almighty. In the English Reformation the caution of Luther has been tempered with the spirit of Calvin; but it may well be questioned, whether this moderation could have been attained, if these two reformations had not been separately effected.

The Helvetic church had not only two founders, but two distinct characters, Calvin having superinduced several important modifications on the system established by Zuingle. This Swiss reformer had subjected the clergy to the control

tings published against the mass, commanded that in the middle of each of the four most frequent parts of Paris eight of the reformed should be burned alive; or, according to another account, six in Paris, and more than twice as many in other parts of the kingdom. Calvin then withdrew to Basle, and from Basle proceeded to Italy; being driven from that country by the Inquisition, he returned to France; and being again driven from France, he resolved to return to Basle, or to visit Strasburg. The direct road to Germany being obstructed by war, he was induced to go through Geneva, though without any intention of remaining there; and to this casual visit, in the year 1536, must be referred the establishment of a system so much influenced by local circumstances. In Geneva he found the reformed religion already established. The resistance however, excited by his peculiar system of discipline, compelled him in the following year to retire; but he was recalled from this new *hegyra* in the year 1541, and permitted to model the ecclesiastical government according to his pleasure.—Life of Calvin, by Mackenzie, pp. 37—50. Hist. de Genève, par Spon, tome i. pp. 275—284. Abrégé Chron., par Mezeray, tome v. pp. 439, 440.

of the civil magistracy[67], and had allowed a difference of ranks and a subordination among the ministers of his church. In regard to the eucharist he embraced the opinion first proposed by Carlostadt[68], that the body and blood of Christ are not in any sense really present, the bread and wine being merely symbols. He also appears to have differed little from the Pelagian doctrine[69], which maintains the moral sufficiency of the unassisted powers of man. Calvin on the other hand withdrew the church from the control of the civil government, subjecting it only to the superintendence of presbyteries. In his opinion of the eucharist he made some approach to the Lutheran doctrine, holding that it was not merely, as Zuingle had taught, a symbolical representation of the death of Christ, but that there is also a real, though a spiritual presence of Christ, in this sacrament. Above all, he introduced, and zealously inculcated, the doctrine of the absolute decree of God[70], by which, according to his own good pleasure, and without any reference to the conduct of men, he from all eternity had predestined some to ever-

[67] Mosheim, vol. iv. p. 377. [68] Luther, when he rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation, maintained that of consubstantiation, teaching that those who partook of the eucharist, received the real body and blood of Christ together with the bread and wine. The divines of Swisserland objected to the Lutherans, that our Saviour could not be everywhere corporeally present, as was implied in the doctrine of consubstantiation. The Lutherans endeavoured to remove the objection by what they termed the communication of properties, alleging that the divine nature, by which Christ, as God, is omnipresent, was united to his human nature, and communicated to it this property of omnipresence, so that he was *corporeally* present where he was *spiritually* present.—Bp. Marsh's Lect. on Divinity, p. 73. The opinion of the Lutherans was an important improvement, inasmuch as it precluded the worship of the sacramental elements. Carlostadt, supposing that our Saviour pointed to his own body as he spoke, contended that the bread and wine were merely symbolical. It was afterwards perceived that the words of our Saviour should be figuratively applied to the bread and wine as symbols. [69] Mosheim, vol. iv. p. 369.

[70] Calvin, who acknowledged this to be 'a horrible decree,' because he saw that reprobation cannot be separated from election, endeavoured to justify it by referring the distinction of right and wrong to the will of the Deity, concluding that it must be unreasonable to question his decree, since whatever he wills, should be esteemed just because he wills it.—Instit., lib. iii. cap. xxiii. sect. i. ii. vii. The scriptural doctrine of predestination has been very ably, though rather too scholastically, examined by Plaifere, in his Appeal to the Gospel.

lasting happiness, and others to endless misery. The first of these three alterations was firmly resisted by the Swiss Protestants. It seems as if the little republic of Geneva was the only community, in which the church could, in the beginning[71], be rendered thus independent, nor had this been effected even there without a violent struggle, in which the reformer was driven into a temporary exile. In regard to the other peculiarities of his system Calvin prevailed with the Swiss churches to unite with that of Geneva, first in relation to the doctrine of the eucharist, and afterwards in respect of that of predestination.

The doctrine of Calvin, in regard to the great question of human salvation, is so opposite to that of Zuingle, that it may be difficult to conceive, how it has been adopted by those, who had received from the latter their first notion of religious reformation. A medium of transition did however exist between the two systems, for Zuingle held the philosophical necessity of human actions[72], which was easily transformed into the notion of a necessity created by the arbitrary decree of God. In another particular also they exhibited that tendency towards union, which is so often exemplified in extreme opinions[73]. Both, though from contrary

[71] When however this had been done there, the arrangement might be introduced into other states, in which it could not have had its origin. It was accordingly introduced into France about the middle of the sixteenth century, into Germany and Scotland in the year 1560, and into the Netherlands in the year 1571. The English refugees, after the accession of Edward VI. in the year 1547, brought with them from Frankfort the principles of Calvin. It is characteristic of this austere church, that during more than a century it admitted no music into its service, whereas in the Lutheran church every thing which could be so applied, even the confession of Augsburg, was adapted to music.—Butler's Account of Anc. and Mod. Music, annexed to his Life of Fenelon. Lond., 1819. [72] Archbishop Laurence's Bampton Lectures, p. 389. Oxford, 1805. [73] The doctrine of Calvin accordingly, while it recedes as much as possible from the Roman doctrine of merit, tends to generate the same disregard of the laws of morality, the one disposing men to refer their hope of salvation to the divine decree, and the other to the observances of the church. It is remarkable that the late Rev. Thomas Scott, the most distinguished of the Calvinistical clergy of England, has declared his certain knowledge, that religion, by which he must be understood to mean religion agreeable to his own conception of it, was 'in many places wofully verging to antinomianism.'—Life of the Rev. Thomas Scott, ch. viii. Lond., 1822.

principles, degraded the second person of the Godhead from his importance in the salvation of men; the doctrine of the natural sufficiency of man left nothing for a Redeemer to perform, and that of an arbitrary decree referred all to the predetermination of the Father. Nor was this common tendency of the two doctrines unnoticed even in the age of the reformation. Zuingle, though he succeeded in satisfying in this respect the mind of Luther[74], had been accused of entertaining an unworthy notion of the divinity of Christ; and Calvin, though he has in his celebrated *Institution* maintained the orthodox doctrine, of which he also gave a barbarous confirmation in promoting the punishment of Servetus[75], was yet obliged to plead his cause at Berne against a charge of Arianism[76], and his opinions were early represented by Lutheran writers as of a unitarian tendency[77]. In later times this common tendency has been more distinctly manifested, as it appears to have been the principle of that ascendency, which the doctrine of Zuingle[78] has

[74] Mosheim, vol. iv. p. 75. [75] Michael Servede, or Servetus, a Spanish physician, published in the years 1531 and 1532, seven books in the Latin language concerning the errors contained in the doctrine of the trinity, and two dialogues also on the same subject. In the year 1553, having settled at Vienne in Dauphiné, he published his own system of Theology, under the title of *Christianismi Restitutio*. Having escaped from Vienne, where he had been imprisoned, he endeavoured to pass into Italy, but on his way Calvin caused him to be apprehended in Geneva, and to be accused of blasphemy, for which he was condemned to the flames by the council. His doctrine, which was to the last degree obscure and embarrassed, seems to have been strangely compounded of that of Sabellius, who denied the distinctness of personality in the trinity, and of that of Spinosa, who maintained that the universe is God. His punishment was inflicted agreeably to the laws, which had existed before the reformation; but the spirit of those laws subsisted with them, nor did any of the reformers, not even Melancthon, question their propriety. Calvin indeed is entitled to the credit of having endeavoured to cause him to be sentenced to a death less severe. —Mosh., vol. iv. p. 488. Life of Servetus by Chauffpié, pp. 121, &c. Lond., 1771. [76] Mackenzie's Life of Calvin, p. 43.

[77] Albertus Grawerus de novo ac horrendo errore circa doctrinam de satisfactione Christi pro peccatis humani generis, pp. 8. 9. Jenæ, 1621; and Locorum Theologicorum Johannis Gherhardi, tom. iii. p. 290.

[78] D'Alembert, in his Short Account of the Government of Geneva, has remarked, that perfect Socinianism was in his time the religion of most of the pastors of Geneva.—Miscell. Pieces, p. 73. Lond., 1764. In these countries a similar change has manifested itself among presbyterians, in the distinction of the *New* and the *Old Light*.

obtained over that of Calvin, the degradation of the importance of the Redeemer, though a common result of both systems, being more strictly congenial with the former.

In the commencement of the reformation[79] both Luther and Melancthon were led by their opposition to the Romish doctrine of meritorious performances to maintain the contrary doctrine of the necessity of human actions. But both abandoned this opinion so early as in the year 1527, probably influenced by the arguments of Erasmus. In the confession of Augsburg prepared in the year 1530, though it is held that, independently of the Holy Spirit, human nature is incapable of doing any thing good, yet it is not taught that the gift of the Holy Spirit is regulated by an arbitrary decree. Luther indeed distinctly expressed his persuasion of the universality of the offered assistance of God[80]. Accordingly, when the council of Trent[81], in the year 1546, came to the consideration of the question of predestination, they found nothing deserving their animadversion in the writings of Luther, or in the confession of Augsburg; but they are said to have sought for it among the Zuinglians. The great question of the reformation was that concerning the merit of human performances; and the question of predestination was in truth a superfetation of that other controversy, generated by the dogmatising refinement of the mind of Calvin. To Augustin this doctrine had been suggested by the vehemence of his opposition to Pelagius; in the reformer of Geneva it appears to have been the subtlety of a systematic theologian.

Zuingle had not proposed to abolish all distinctions of rank among the clergy. Calvin, by rejecting every gradation of ecclesiastical authority, by exalting at the same time the powers of ecclesiastical government to a rigorous superintendence of discipline, and by proposing his church of Geneva as the universal model of all, which should adopt his peculiar opinions, not only preserved among his own people, but also extended as widely as the reception of his religious system, the habits of republican government. That the presbyterian form of ecclesiastical government was

[79] Archbishop Laurence's Bampton Lectures, p. 249. [80] Seckendorf, lib. i. p. 313. [81] F. Paul's Hist. of the Council of Trent, p. 197. Lond., 1676.

adopted by Calvin[82], appears however to have arisen from this mere contingency, that the bishop of Geneva persisted in opposing the reformation. Calvin indeed has expressly declared[83], that he rejected episcopacy only for the want of merit in the bishops, admitting that it had been derived from the apostles. It is a matter of historic record, that Calvin with Bullinger and others[84], in a letter addressed to Edward VI. of England, offered to make him their defender, and to have bishops in their churches, as in England; and Calvin has expressly admitted[85], that his church was deficient in not maintaining the ancient episcopacy.

The Lutheran church of Germany holds a middle place between presbyterian and episcopal establishments, maintaining with the former[86] that no law of divine authority has ordained any distinction among the ministers of the gospel, but admitting such a distinction with the latter for the sake of convenience. The Lutherans[87] would indeed at Smalkalde have acknowledged the jurisdiction of bishops, if they would have reformed the church. The middle character of their system, which was formed under the protection of the civil authorities, fitted it for accommodating itself to episcopal arrangements, where these should be generally favourable to the reformation; and accordingly, when the Lutheran Reformation was received in Sweden and Denmark, the episcopal establishments of these countries continued to subsist, the bishops taking the place of the German superintendents.

Both churches are governed by consistories, but differing in this particular, that those of the Calvinists admit lay-elders. This difference[88] arose from the anxiety of Calvin to maintain in his church an effective discipline, for which purpose he seems to have judged it necessary to associate laymen with the ministers. The church of Calvin thus

[82] The first person, who maintained that no distinction should be acknowledged between bishops and presbyters, was Ærius, a monk in the latter part of the fourth century, who propagated this doctrine, together with others tending to simplify religious worship, throughout Armenia, Pontus, and Capadocia.—Mosheim, vol. i. p. 387. [83] Calv. Op., tom. ix. pp. 49, 60. [84] Ridley's Life of Bishop Ridley.
[85] Calv. Op., tom. viii. p. 198. [86] Mosheim, vol. iv. pp. 287, 288.
[87] Seckendorf, lib. iii. p. 258. [88] Hist. de Genève, par Spon, tom. i. p. 287, note.

drew to itself the power of the state, whereas that of Luther attached itself to the state, of which it admitted the supremacy.

The political influence of the German Reformation on the system of Europe consisted especially in dividing the empire into two great parties, the struggle of which was instrumental to the arrangement of the federative interest of the European states. The Reformation of Geneva on the other hand appears to have been fitted by its ecclesiastical arrangement to infuse into the states of Europe a spirit of civil independence, at the time when the general exaltation of the sovereign authority seems to have rendered such a reinforcement of the principle of freedom necessary to the general welfare. It is certain that the whiggism of our own government may be traced to this source, and consequently all the political advantage, which we have derived from its influence in maintaining our civil liberties. The same Reformation furnished the new republic of the Dutch provinces with an ecclesiastical establishment analogous to the genius of its government, and fitted to maintain its character, which has exercised an important agency on the federative combinations of Europe. It also generated in the adjacent country of France a religious republic comprehended within a monarchy, crushed indeed by that monarchy for a considerable time, but in its power and influence surviving the disaster, and at length mainly contributing to the revolution of the government of that country, which has put an end to an exhausted system of federative relations, and given a beginning to new and different combinations of policy.

As Germany afforded a suitable theatre for Lutheranism, and Swisserland for Calvinism, so in a later period has the extreme freedom of Poland allowed the adversaries of the trinitarian doctrine to form in that country the church[89] which has received its denomination from two Italians, each named Socinus, the latter the nephew of the former. These men, who at first had connected themselves with the Calvinists of Poland, were in the year 1565, on account of the dissensions which they had excited, required to form a distinct congregation. At this time they professed chiefly the

[89] Mosheim, vol. iv. pp. 498, &c.

Arian doctrine; but simple unitarianism soon prevailed among them, and in the year 1574 they published a confession of this doctrine. From Poland the doctrine of Socinus made its way into Transylvania in the year 1563, and has maintained itself in that distant province. The Socinians of Poland laboured, but with little success, to propagate their doctrine into the other countries of Europe, publishing for this purpose at Racow, their metropolis, a considerable number of books, the greater part of which was in the year 1656 republished in six volumes in folio, under the title of *Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum.*

The influence of Socianism appears to have consisted in maintaining, with much exaggerated pretensions indeed, the claim of human reason, as opposed to too implicit an admission of received doctrines. Heresy is in every case the check of orthodoxy, and the existence of a Socinian church may accordingly have been a salutary restraint on too strong a disposition to dogmatize. The two distinct reformations of Germany and Swisserland seem to have co-operated to form juster notions of religious truth, than any which could have been apprehended under the influence of a single movement of this description; and the doctrine of Socinus seems to have served to keep both within the limit of a reasonable interpretation of the sacred scriptures, by urging, though to an unwarrantable extreme, the pretension of reason to pronounce upon the faith of Christians.

Though the reformation was a separation from a church so deeply corrupted, that it had ceased to inculcate the doctrines of a genuine faith, yet it so reacted upon that church, as to dispose its adherents to moderate the abuses, of which their adversaries complained, and to combine with their ceremonious ritual some portion of the piety of a more reasonable service. In France too, where the religion of Rome was exposed to the derision of infidels, as well as to the arguments of Protestants, efforts have been latterly employed to exhibit its peculiar doctrines in a manner less offensive to the minds of its opponents. In this manner a church, which had almost ceased to be a religious establishment, was qualified to continue to hold its place in the combinations of Europe, as the opponent of those others, which appealed to the scriptures for a purer faith. The

time had not yet arrived, when a purer faith could be generally propagated, and the adjustment of the political interests of Europe was aided by the struggle.

The council assembled at Trent in the year 1545, by which the emperor had vainly hoped to compose the religious dissensions of Germany, was instrumental[90] in giving stability to the church of Rome. Doctrines, which had been received on the credit of tradition alone, and had been interpreted with some degree of latitude, were then sanctioned by a formal authority, and defined with a scrupulous exactness; and ceremonies, which had been observed only in deference to a supposed antiquity, were then pronounced to be essential parts of the worship of the church. As the line of separation was thus more distinctly drawn between the two contending systems of Christianity, which were accordingly placed in more direct opposition, the council assisted the cause of the reformation, and favoured the political combinations, which were afterwards formed by its struggles.

The church of Rome had also before this time received a powerful support[91] by the institution of the order of Jesuits, which was founded in the year 1540. Originating in the weakness of a distempered fanatic, but afterwards organised with consummate ability, this celebrated society gave new energy to the declining system, when the ancient orders had lost their influence and importance. Devoted with more implicit submission to the will of the pontiff[92],

[90] Hist. of Charles V., vol. iv. p. 84. The creed of Pius IV., published in the year 1564, the year following that of the dissolution of the council, has ever since that time been considered as an accurate and explicit summary of the Roman Catholic faith.—Butler's Book of the Roman Catholic Church, p. 5. Lond., 1825. In this creed thirteen articles have been added to the Nicene creed. [91] Hist. of Charles V., vol. iii. p. 203. [92] 'When the fanatic Ignatius first solicited the confirmation of his order by the Roman pontiff Paul III., the learned and worthy cardinal Guidiccioni opposed his request with great vehemence. But this opposition was vanquished by the dexterity of Ignatius, who, changing the articles of his institution, in which he had promised obedience to the pope with certain restrictions, turned it in such a manner, as to bind his order by a solemn vow of *implicit blind and unlimited submission and obedience* to the Roman pontiff.'—Note by the transl. of Mosheim, vol. iv. p. 155. The whole order, we are informed by Mosheim, ibid., pp. 187, 188, is divided into three

it was a more ready instrument of the papal authority; mingling in all the active concerns of political life, it was present in every place, in which its assistance could be serviceable to the Roman see; and engrossing to itself the instruction of the rising generation, it formed to habits of future submission and attachment the yielding understandings and characters of the young. Such was the rapidity of its growth that,[93] at the close of a century, it comprehended nineteen thousand persons; a powerful association of men, all intelligent, and zealous and active for the interests of Rome.

At length in the year 1556 was terminated, by the abdication of Charles V.[94], a most important period of thirty-seven years, in which by the restless activity of that monarch the energies of the principal kingdoms of Europe were developed and exercised, in which those states were by continual agitations brought within the action of their reciprocal influences, and a religious separation was at the same time effected, generating an opposition of political interests, and by that opposition a system of federative relations throughout the governments of Europe. In Germany his efforts had been vainly exerted in endeavouring to establish his own power by maintaining the unity of the church. Disappointed at length in all his views, foreign and domestic, and at the same time shattered in his constitution, he retired from the scene of public affairs, leaving them to the management of his brother and his son.

One considerable country may indeed be regarded, as

classes, of which the first, who are the true and perfect Jesuits, besides the three ordinary vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, common to all the monastic tribes, are obliged to take a fourth, by which they solemnly bind themselves to go, without deliberation or delay, wherever the pope shall think fit to send them. [93] Butler's Hist. Mem. of the Jesuits, annexed to his Life of Fenelon, p. 286. [94] This prince in the year 1555 resigned to his son Philip the seventeen provinces of the Netherlands, when he had vainly repeated his most strenuous endeavours with his brother, to procure for Philip the succession of the throne of the empire. In the following year he also resigned to him at Brussels the kingdom of Spain with its dependencies, and sent an embassy into Germany, to notify his abdication of the imperial dignity. Various causes however rendered it impracticable to assemble a diet for receiving his renunciation of the empire before the year 1558.—Pfeffel, tome ii. pp. 176, 177.

having within this period been deprived of its political existence, for the independence of Italy was suppressed in the year 1530, when Florence was reduced by the arms of Charles V., this state being in the following year[95] converted into a feudatory principality of the empire under the family of the Medici. Thus was subjugated this interesting republic, which had been so *instinct with spirit,* that of a population of eighty thousand persons[96] two or three thousand citizens occupied in a rapid rotation the chief offices of the government, and by the wisdom of their administration procured for the state an importance far exceeding its very limited resources. Liberty had given to Italy four ages of glory. It was then finally extinguished in that republic, in which it had shone with its brightest, as with its latest splendour. But the liberty of Italy was an agency, which had discharged its functions, and had become superfluous to the system of Europe. The growing organisation, having begun to exercise its own powers for its support and nourishment, no longer required, or admitted, that an umbilical duct should convey to it extraneous supplies, fitted only for developing an embryo-formation. The republic of Florence has however bequeathed to succeeding ages, in the writings of Machiavel, the restoration of political philosophy, corrupted indeed with the vicious principles of the period, and, in his history of the republic itself, the first example of a classical composition of this kind in modern times and in a modern language.

The age of Leo X., whose pontificate was however limited to the narrow space of not quite nine years, has been commonly reckoned as one of the four periods, in which the human intellect has experienced remarkable improvement,

[95] The constitution, established according to the capitulation, restored and legitimated the power before enjoyed by the Medici, restoring at the same time the forms of a republican government. Clement VII. however, the head of that family, abolished the republican institutions in the year 1532, constituting Alexander duke of Florence, and giving him councils so selected, that the will of the prince was invariably observed. Cosmo, the immediate successor of Alexander, was by a papal bull in the year 1569 declared grand duke of Tuscany, which title was in the year 1575 confirmed to the succeeding duke by the emperor.—Hist. des Repub. Ital., tome xvi. pp. 67—85.

[96] Ibid., p. 403.

the others being the ages of Alexander, of Augustus Cæsar, and of Louis XIV. In the time of Leo, and under the influence of his patronage, a decisive progress was certainly made in literature and the arts. In literature pecuniary assistance was afforded by this pontiff to Ariosto[97], especially for defraying the expense of publishing his celebrated poem; and among those whom he patronised, is found Gian-Giorgio Trissino, the author of *Sofonisba*, entitled to our notice[98], not only as having first introduced the *versi sciolti*, or blank verse, into general use, but also as having been the first regular tragedy since the revival of letters. To the time of this pontiff is to be referred the perfecting of the jocose Italian satire[99], which had originated in Florence towards the close of the preceding century. Francesco Berni, who revived and perfected this whimsical style of composition, probably led the way for Rabelais, Cervantes, and Sterne, his writings having been in lively and unaffected verse, what the works of these writers are in prose. Latin poetry was however that, which chiefly engaged the attention of Leo[100]. The arts indeed experienced his most liberal protection; and their most illustrious period is accordingly that which[101], having commenced with the return of Michael Angelo from Rome to Florence about the year 1500, was terminated by the death of Leo in the year 1521, or rather by the death of Raffael in the preceding year.

Italy, during the remainder of the sixteenth century, continued to exhibit the appearance of life under the influence of various causes[102], which still operated even after liberty had been destroyed. The most remarkable indication of this remaining vitality was that, which was afforded by the genius of Tasso, the epic poet of the modern Italians. Ariosto, who had adorned the earlier part of the century, was the poet of romance, and by his *Orlando Furioso* prepared the way for that combination of romantic with classical poetry, which in the *Gierusalemme Liberata* of Tasso constituted the modern epic, classic in the general arrangement, but romantic in the portraiture of manners and situation[103].

[97] Roscoe's Life of Leo X., vol. iii. p. 210. [98] Ibid., pp. 238—240. [99] Ibid., pp. 226—229. [100] Ibid., p. 258.
[101] Ibid., p. 197. [102] Sismondi de la Litt. du Midi, tome ii. p. 157. [103] Hist. des Repub. Ital., tome xvi. pp. 221—223.

The genius of Tasso, thus rising to our admiration after his country had begun to sink into obscurity, resembled those luminous objects, which the astronomer discovers within the dark part of the lunar orb, catching by their elevation the rays, which could not reach the low surrounding level, and claiming to belong rather to the portion illuminated by the full radiance of the solar light. The splendour of the arts of design was obscured at the same time with that of literature. Michael Angelo was contemporary to Ariosto: his pupils and successors flourished with Tasso; and genius ceased at the same time to express itself in verse, and by the hand of the artist. Scientific inquiry resisted longer the baneful influence of Italian degradation. Galileo, who was born in the year 1564, gave in the seventeenth century, and under the control of the Inquisition, his confirmation to the theory of Copernicus, and was followed by his pupil Torricelli, who by the invention of the barometer began the philosophy of the atmosphere.

The depravation of the Italians, which was consequent to their loss of liberty, was consummated in the practice of *chichisbeism*, a system of licensed adultery, which polluted all the relations, and poisoned all the enjoyments, of domestic life. This profligate usage, introduced in the seventeenth century, by some licentious courts[104], was generally adopted, as it served to provide occupation for a crowd of younger brothers, who were destitute of employment, because under the influence of Spanish prejudices they had become too proud for commerce, and were at the same time too poor for marriage, all right of inheritance being sacrificed to the claim of primogeniture. The practice. which had thus resulted from the debasement of the Italians, spread in the following century from Italy into Spain[105], where it avenged the wrongs of the dependent country. Perhaps, however it may be thought to have been in a corrupted people a restriction of the grosser immorality, which would otherwise have attended the admission of females into general society.

Though Italy was the country of the papal residence, and

[104] These male paramours are in Spain named *cortejos*, in Italy, *cicisbei*. [105] The occasion was the introduction of Italian manners, on the arrival of Charles III. from Naples, in the year 1759.—Townsend's Journey through Spain, vol. ii. p. 249. Dublin, 1792.

multitudes of persons found a direct interest in supporting the papal establishment, yet the reformation of religion had in various parts of the peninsula numerous adherents, especially in Ferrara[106], where learning had been much encouraged, and in Venice[107], which was jealous of the encroachments of the papacy, and tolerant through the policy of commerce. In that country, as in Spain, it was suppressed by a persecution, which was there begun in the year 1542, and continued to the end of the sixteenth century[108]. If it had been then established, it would probably have disturbed the political relations of Europe, which were formed amidst the struggles of Protestants and Roman Catholics. Nor does its suppression in that country appear to be entitled to much regret, for the reformed opinions of the Italians were early[109], and very generally tainted by the doctrine of Socinus. The philosophy of Plato[110], the revival of which had been useful in destroying the authority of the scholastic theology, was so captivating to the ingenious minds of that people, as to have indisposed them for the reception of the revealed truths of the gospel. The suppression of the reformation in Italy seems indeed to have corresponded to the humiliation of the original church of Greece, as in each case the minds of the people were too much occupied in fanciful refinements for the simplicity of scriptural doctrine.

[106] M'Crie's Hist. of the Reformation in Italy, p. 86. [107] Ibid., pp. 118—128. [108] Ibid., pp. 217—347. On this occasion the Inquisition was established at Rome, under the name of the congregation of the holy office, the jurisdiction of which, though long resisted at Venice, was gradually extended throughout Italy. The Italian was milder than the Spanish Inquisition, because the popes, being temporal princes in the states of the church, had no occasion to employ it there to undermine the secular authorities. On this account its operations were suspended in Italy, when the reformation had been suppressed. But the chief difference, while its operations were continued, consisted in this, that in Rome publicity of punishment was avoided, whereas in Spain, the object was to strike terror by public spectacles. [109] Ibid., pp. 177, 180. [110] Ibid., p. 182.

CHAPTER II.

Of the history of Spain and Portugal, from the commencement of the reign of the emperor Charles V. in Spain, in the year 1516, *to that of the reign of Philip III. of Spain, in the year* 1598.

Charles king of Spain, in the year 1516—Cortes of Castile ruined, 1539—Philip prince of Spain, married to Mary of England, 1554—Philip II. king of Spain, 1556—Death of Mary, 1558—Persecution of the Netherlands begun, 1559—The Turks repulsed from Malta, 1565—defeated at Lepanto, 1571—War of the Netherlands begun, 1572—Union of Utrecht formed, 1578—Armada sent against England, 1588—The constitution of Aragon abolished, 1592—The Dutch first sailed to India, 1595—The government of Spain bankrupt, 1596—Portuguese empire in India completed, 1547—Portugal united with Spain, 1580—Garcilaso de la Vega—Cervantes—Lope de Vega—Calderon—Bernardim Ribeyro—Camoens.

When the principles of the federative policy had been developed in Italy by Lorenzo de Medici for the protection of Florence, it was extended over Europe in two successive periods; the German, in which the interests of the principal states of the continent were adjusted by the treaty of Westphalia, and those others, which were supplementary to its arrangements, and the French, in which the maritime interests of Europe were combined with the former in a more comprehensive arrangement. In the former of these two operations Germany was the grand agent, and the empire had accordingly acquired a temporary ascendency, which drew forth the efforts of France, in aid of a confederation of some of its own states. In the latter the primary impulse was given by Spain, intimately connected with the maritime interests of Europe, by its possession of the Netherlands, and by its remoter dependencies in the east and west. The reign of Philip II. of Spain was thus the period, in which preparation began to be made for the later adjustment, as that of his father had given a beginning to the former. Provision appears to have been made for the ulterior adjustment so long before the time of the completion of the other, that a sufficient time was allowed, in which the commercial states might improve and collect their resources, and be prepared

to engage with energy and effect in the general struggle of nations.

The reign of Philip II. of Spain, which forced into existence and power the republic of the Dutch provinces, and stimulated to exertion the maritime energies of England, is accordingly the grand object of consideration in the present chapter, the Spanish government of Charles and the contemporary history of Portugal being but introductory to this more important reign. The government of Charles, by reducing the ill-arranged constitution of Castile to a simple monarchy, enabled Philip to proceed in his enterprises with less embarrassment; the Portuguese government completed its great enterprise of oriental dominion, to be transferred to the new republic of the Dutch provinces, when the country should be forced to yield to the ascendency of the neighbouring monarchy, and its more distant dependencies should by the common government be abandoned to the enemy.

The constitution of the Spanish monarchy was a combination of parts ill fitted for co-operation. The industry of the Moors had filled Spain with cities, which under the dominion of the Christians acquired considerable importance in the cortes, as they alone furnished the public supplies. A numerous and powerful nobility had on the other hand been formed in the long contest with the infidels, which stood in these assemblies opposed to the cities. By these two orders[1] the powers of the crown were so much limited, as to be insufficient for retaining them under any regular control. The natural result was that the adverse interests of the two parties should urge them into opposition so direct and open, that the crown was enabled to establish an entire ascendency over both.

This result was accelerated by the discontents of the people. When Charles[2] had, soon after the commencement of his reign, dismissed the Spanish minister, the celebrated Ximenes, and abandoned his subjects of Spain to the unprincipled management of his Flemish counsellors, the Castilians were so indignant, that several cities of the first rank entered into a confederacy for the redress of grievances, the beginning of that union of Castile, which two years afterwards shook the government to its foundation. The ad-

[1] Hist. of Charles V., vol. ii. p. 34. [2] Ibid., pp. 53—68.

vancement of Charles to the imperial throne augmented the jealousy of the Spaniards, who dreaded to see their country reduced to the rank of a dependency on the empire. In the year 1521 these discontents manifested themselves in various insurrections. The nobles[3] at first co-operated with the cities in demanding a redress of the grievances sustained from the sovereign; but the views of the two orders soon became opposed. The latter, encouraged by success, began to seek also the removal of those oppressions, which they suffered from a feudal nobility. From this time the nobles became attached to the cause of the crown. The insurrection of Castile accordingly was soon suppressed, and Charles confirmed the triumph of his power by his moderation, and the address, with which he accommodated himself to the national feeling. Chievres, the chief of his Flemish ministry, having died in the beginning of these troubles, the emperor was left free to attend to the suggestions of his own politic genius.

If Spain had been at this time subject to a single and uniform government, the emperor might have been compelled to yield to the insurgents[4], because these would have been able to act with concert, and to bring their whole power to bear at once upon the throne, while the sovereign was unavoidably engaged in attending to the interest of his other dominions. From this disadvantage however Charles was relieved by the multiplicity and discordance of the local governments of Spain. Not only did the several kingdoms, which had been gradually united under a single prince, retain[5] the distinctness of their several governments, but the people continued to cherish their ancient antipathies, and the forms of government were so various, that the grievances of different districts were different, and the people could not agree in any common plan of redress. Aided by divisions, which separated his adversaries, Charles was enabled to put a sudden end to a general commotion, nor did his power afterwards experience any similar resistance.

At length, in the year 1539[6], the nobles of Castile were

[3] Hist. of Charles V., vol. ii. p. 243. [4] Ibid., p. 267.

[5] Castile, Aragon, Catalonia, Valencia, and Navarre, had each its cortes, and Biscay its peculiar states. [6] Hist. of Charles V., vol. iii. pp. 182—184.

induced to unite with the representatives of the cities in refusing a supply demanded by the emperor, being anxious to maintain their feudal exemption from taxation. But the sovereign, whose power they had previously exalted against the cities, availed himself of it to depress his unsteady adherents, and, dismissing the assembly, ceased to summon to the public councils the nobles and the prelates, as persons who should not claim the right of voting in the imposition of taxes, which they would not pay. From that time the cortes of Castile consisted only of thirty-six members, the representatives of eighteen cities; and the assembly, having lost its former dignity and importance, became uniformly submissive to the crown.

The yet more free constitution of Aragon continued to exist more than half a century after the cortes of Castile had been thus ruined; but in the year 1592 this also was violated by Philip II., who however thought it unnecessary to issue any formal decree of abolition[7]. Availing himself of a sedition, which his own attorney had provoked, this prince sent from Castile a body of troops, the leader of which, without any form of trial, put to death the chief magistrate, named the justiza, confiscated his property, and by a proclamation denounced a similar treatment of all, who should presume to dispute the authority of the king. In the year 1713 the constitution was finally abolished[8], and the governments of Aragon, Valentia, and Catalonia were assimilated to that of Castile. The cortes of Portugal appear to have fallen into disuse probably in imitation of Spain.

In another respect also the reign of Charles was preparatory to that of his successor, as in it was effected a matrimonial alliance between Philip and Mary of England. The alliance was not of long duration, Mary having died at the end of four years from her marriage; but, besides that, even within that time, it involved the English in a war with France, which deprived them of Calais, their last possession on the continent, it was the principle of the hostilities afterwards waged by Philip against England, with all their important influences on the interests of these countries.

Portugal was in the same interval making its peculiar

[7] Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. ii. p. 322. Dubl., 1777.

[8] Coxe's Mem. of the Bourbon Kings of Spain, vol. i. p. 420. 4to.

preparation for the approaching period, in which the peninsula should become the prevailing agent in adjusting the relations of Europe. It first completed the arrangement of its Indian empire, and then disposed itself to submit to the humiliation of a union with Spain. The history of Portugal in this interval is indeed wholly comprehended within these two classes of transactions, for we read only of its eastern concerns, until that series of disastrous events began, which deprived it of its national existence.

Albuquerque, who founded the Indian empire of Portugal, died in the year preceding that, in which Charles succeeded to the crown of Spain; and it was completed by John de Castro, who died in his government in the year 1547[9]. From this time it began to decline, though it was occasionally re-established by the energy of viceroys sent from Portugal. Through all these struggles the Portuguese were encountered with the most obstinate resistance by the Turks and Egyptians, who were united under the same government in the year 1517, when Egypt was reduced by the Turkish sultan. In the year 1526 an adverse power was formed in India itself, the Mogul empire of India[10], which had been held as it were in suspense during a hundred and twenty-seven years from the invasion of Tamerlane, having been then begun by Baber. The Turks and Egyptians served to restrain within due bounds the first impetuosity of the Portuguese. The Mogul empire, while it served also to control the spirit of conquest, was favourable to the commercial interests of Portugal. Having been formed by a nation merely continental, it was not actuated by that commercial jealousy, which had sent the Turks and Egyptians into the east to oppose the progress of its people; and the creed of its founder, though Mohammedan, was so temperate[11], that it opposed little of a religious antipathy to the intercourse of the two nations.

[9] It comprehended the kingdoms of Sofala, Mozambique, and Melinda, on the Eastern coast of Africa; the isle of Ormus in the Persian gulf; the whole coast of Malabar with Ceylon; Malacca with a part of the Molucca islands; and Macao in China.—De la Clede, tome ii. p. 509. [10] Book ii. ch. xi., note[28]. [11] 'He was of the sect of the Hanisites, in whose doctrine and tenets he was perfectly versed, yielding more to the evidence of reason, than to the marvellous legends of superstitious antiquity. He was not however forgetful of that ra-

Ten years after the completion of the Indian empire of Portugal, began the preparation for its compulsory union with Spain, Sebastian, whose wild ambition effected the ruin of his country, having then succeeded to the throne. This prince being at his accession only three years old, the government was necessarily committed to a regency; it appears however to have been well administered, first by the grandmother, and then by a cardinal, who was uncle of the king. In this interval, comprehending eleven years, the kingdom is indeed described as enjoying much prosperity, and the capital as daily improving in magnitude and magnificence[12]; but the young king, educated by women and monks, acquired a zeal of hostility against infidels, which, acting on a mind naturally ardent and impetuous, resembled mental derangement, rather than ordinary passion. Having at the age of fourteen years received the reins of government, Sebastian soon manifested the influence of this ruling propensity of his mind. He expressed a design of going to India, and was dissuaded from the distant enterprise, only by proposing that he should rather direct his efforts against the Moors of Africa. In this expedition he perished in the year 1578: he was succeeded on the throne by his uncle the cardinal, at this time incapacitated by age; the superannuated successor himself died at the end of two years, leaving the kingdom to a regency of five persons, nominated to settle a very disputed succession[13]; and after a short contest with these governors, and with Antonio, the illegitimate offspring of a son of king Emmanuel, Philip II. of Spain, the son of a daughter of the same king, possessed himself of the throne of Portugal, and thus in the year 1580 united under his dominion the whole peninsula.

It is remarkable that the pretension of the duke of Bra-

tional worship, which is due to the great Creator, nor a despiser of those laws and ceremonies, which are founded on sound policy for the benefit of the superficial judges of things.'—Dow's Transl. of Ferishta, vol. ii. p. 138. [12] De la Clede, tome ii. p. 51. [13] The principal claimants were the duchess of Braganza, a grand-daughter of king Emmanuel; Philip II. of Spain, the prince of Parma, and the duke of Savoy, all great-grandsons of the same king; and Antonio, a grandson, but illegitimate. Henry, the cardinal-king, was disposed to decide in favour of the duchess; but he feared the opposition of Antonio, who was favoured by the populace.—Hist. of the Revol. of Portugal, prefixed to Sir R. Southwell's account of the Revol. in 1667, pp. 66, 67. Dubl., 1759.

ganza to the throne of Portugal both facilitated the union of the two monarchies in a very important degree, and also prepared remotely its subsequent dissolution. The duke, having married Catherine, a grand-daughter of king Emmanuel, claimed the crown in the right of his wife, who was by one degree of descent nearer to that monarch, than Philip the son of another grand-daughter. This pretension, which, if he had been a man of ability, might have defeated the project of the king of Spain, just served in his case to embarrass the claim of Antonio, and thus to distract the counsels of the Portuguese. When again the union had been effected, it became the policy of the government to discountenance and depress the house of Braganza ; the private wrongs of this distinguished family were accordingly from that time incorporated with the general oppression, by which it was proposed to break and humble the spirit of the nation ; and thus, when at the close of sixty years the measure of the public grievances was full, and every heart was ready to brave the peril of the struggle, the grandson of this duke was ready as a leader, convinced that there was no safety for himself but in the restoration of his country, and happily free from the interference of any other pretension.

Before the union of Portugal, Philip had governed his hereditary dominions twenty-four years, during which he was busily engaged in various transactions most intimately affecting the general policy of Europe. The house of Austria fortunately was during this time divided into two branches, those of Germany and Spain, the more completely separated[14] as the disgust occasioned by the refusal of Ferdinand to relinquish the imperial crown to his nephew, had occasioned a visible alienation and rivalry. By the separation the monarchy of Spain was left alone, to prosecute, without a power too great to be controlled, its own schemes of aggrandisement, while Germany enjoyed a long interval of tranquillity, in which it recovered from the agitations of the reformation, and prepared itself for the great war of thirty years, which was the agony of the important treaty of Westphalia.

Philip, though succeeding to but a part of the dominions of his father, was yet at his accession much the most power-

[14] Hist. of Charles V., vol. iv. p. 343.

ful prince of Europe. Possessing the entire monarchy of Spain; commanding Italy by the possession of the Neapolitan and Sicilian territories on the one part, and of the duchy of Milan on the other; ruling the Netherlands, then the most commercial country of the west; enjoying, besides other distant dependencies[15], the sources of treasures[16] which rendered all other governments poor by comparison; having a navy much more considerable than that of any other state; and influencing the counsels of England by his marriage with the queen; Philip by all these advantages was sufficiently qualified to assert a superiority, which should provoke the resistance of other states, and thus give being to the arrangements still required for completing the adjustment of the interests of Europe. The two sets of movements, by which the empire under Charles V., and Spain under Philip II., were instrumental to that adjustment, were essentially distinct, and belonged to successive periods of the federative policy of Europe. They were accordingly executed by distinct agencies. Spain and the Netherlands were indeed, by the separation of the German branch of the house of Austria, rendered less formidable to the other governments; but they retained all the resources, by which they might affect the interests of commercial states, and these were afterwards augmented by the union of Portugal.

As the reformation was the principle of separation, which in the time of Charles V. arrayed in mutual opposition the two contending parties of Germany, and thus gave a beginning to the great struggle of the continental interests of Europe, so was it, in the time of his son, the relentless bigotry of that prince, which brought into existence the republic of the Dutch states, and drew forth against Spain the energies of England, thus creating that combination of commercial interests, by which a larger and more perfect adjustment was effected, than could be established at the peace of Westphalia. The bigotry of Philip II. was accordingly an efficacious agent in the political arrangements of Europe.

[15] Franche-Comté in France; in Africa, Tunis and Oran, with the Cape-de-Verd and the Canary islands; in Asia, the Philipine and Sunda islands, and a part of the Moluccas; in the west, Hispaniola, Cuba, and many others of the American islands.—Hist. of Philip II., vol. i. p. 17. [16] The mines of America are stated to have brought to him 25,000,000 guilders annually.—Ibid.

The origin of the bigotry of Philip may be traced in the history of his country, though probably it was much strengthened by his own peculiarity of character. For attaching itself to the cause of Rome, Spain had been prepared by almost eight centuries of hostility waged against infidels. The Christians of that country had indeed, amidst all their zeal for religion, maintained a great degree of independence in regard to Rome[17], even observing a distinct liturgy, transmitted from the Gothic period of their history. The Roman liturgy however, towards the close of the eleventh century found its way into Spain[18], and with it brought as a consequence the acknowledgment of the papal supremacy. Four centuries afterwards the Inquisition was established in that country[19], for detecting the numerous Jews, who had sheltered themselves under an exterior profession of Christianity from the violence of those, who were indebted to them, or

[17] The old Gothic church of Spain had maintained an entire independence.—Geddes's Tracts, vol. ii. [18] The controversy between the two liturgies was first submitted to a judicial combat, in which the champion of the Gothic liturgy prevailed; and then to an ordeal of fire, the issue of which was again favourable to the same party, the Gothic liturgy resisting the flames, while the Roman was consumed. The king however, on some slight pretence, ordered that both should be used, the Gothic in the six churches of Toledo, which the Christians had enjoyed under the Moors, and the Roman in all others. The former, being discountenanced by the court, and the superior ecclesiastics, fell gradually into disrepute, and was at length superseded by the latter.—M'Crie's Hist. of the Reform. in Spain, vol. i. pp. 24, 25. The first mass according to the Roman form, was celebrated in Aragon in the year 1071, and in Castile in the year 1086. —Ibid., p. 26. [19] Ibid., p. 87 The bull for establishing the Inquisition in Castile was issued in the year 1478.—Ibid., p. 89. The principles of the ancient and modern Inquisition, says doctor M'Crie, were radically the same, but they assumed a more malignant form under the latter than under the former. The leading difference, he adds, between the two institutions consisted in the organization of the latter into one great independent tribunal, which, extending over the whole kingdom, was governed by one code of laws, and yielded implicit obedience to one head. The inquisitor-general possessed an authority scarcely inferior to that of the king or the pope: by joining with either of them, he proved an overmatch for the other, and, when supported by both, his power was irresistible. The ancient Inquisition was a powerful engine for harassing and rooting out a small body of dissidents: the modern Inquisition stretched its iron arms over a whole nation, upon which it lay like a monstrous incubus, paralysing its exertions, crushing its energies, and extinguishing every other feeling than a sense of weakness and terror.—Ibid., pp. 103, 104.

were envious of their wealth. This dreadful tribunal, originally instituted in the thirteenth century to repress the heretics of the adjacent provinces of France, was then established in Spain, armed with new terrors, to watch the doubtful fidelity of the Jewish converts; but it soon extended its jurisdiction, first to the converts from Mohammedanism, and afterwards over the old Christians, so as to become the scourge of the whole church. The Inquisition, in this more perfect, and therefore more detestable form, was limited to Spain and Portugal, with their dependent territories.

Into this country[20] a knowledge of the reformation was however soon conveyed by the intercourse subsisting with Germany, then subject to a common sovereign, and numerous conversions were effected in various places, especially among persons distinguished by rank or education. It was encountered by the Inquisition, and an unsparing persecution[21] at length in the year 1570 was successful in suppressing it. But the blood of the Spanish martyrs, though unavailing to the reformation of their own country, was not shed in vain, for the cruelty[22], by which their faith was extirpated at home, inspired their fellow-subjects of the Netherlands with that horror of the Inquisition, which consolidated their resistance, and established in the United Provinces the reformed religion in connexion with civil liberty. We may well believe indeed that this salutary horror was not limited to the people of the Netherlands, but animated the exertions of all, who were struggling for the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty. It was during the years 1559 and 1560[23], that the death-blow was given to the reformed religion in Spain; and in the same time the religious liberties of the Protestants of Germany were finally secured, a reformed church was regularly organised in France, and the cause of religious reformation after a long struggle attained a permanent establishment in Scotland. In England the remembrance of the merciless bigotry of Mary, associated with the reports of Spanish cruelty, supported Elizabeth against the machinations of her enemies.

For exciting the commercial energies of Europe, Spain

[20] M'Crie's Hist. of the Reform. in Spain, vol. i. ch. iv. [21] Ibid., p. 336. [22] Ibid., p. 345. [23] Ibid., p. 346.

was peculiarly fitted, partly by the possession of the dominion of the Netherlands, partly by that of the distant territories, which supported her marine, and furnished the principal supply of the precious metals. As the Netherlands were just then rising to the summit of opulence and prosperity, the connexion of those provinces with Spain afforded that country an opportunity of giving a strong impulse to the commercial interests of the continent. Her other resources at the same time enabled her to equip and support navies, with which she might provoke the exertions of the maritime powers of that period; and her dependencies presented objects, which attracted and rewarded the enterprise of her enemies. The *armada*, falsely named invincible, roused the naval efforts of the English nation, and the Spanish settlements furnished rich prizes for the predatory expeditions of Rawley and of Blake.

The curious part of the process is that the operation was not single, but comprehended two commercial states, one of which, the republic of the Dutch provinces, was even indebted to it for existence. It appears that an insular government could not, without a preparatory apparatus, be intimately engaged in the relations of continental policy; and that this apparatus was supplied by a commercial state of the continent, necessitated by its situation to concern itself in the continental combinations, which, by furnishing a sovereign to the insular government, should extend to the latter its own federative character. Italy, we have seen, was the organ, which originally formed, and then transmitted to the empire, the earlier combinations of the federative policy of Europe. Those of a later period were prepared, and transferred to the English government, by the republic of the United Provinces.

The people of the Dutch provinces had been from early times prepared for asserting their independence. The provinces of the Netherlands[24], long governed by their respective princes, under the titles of dukes, marquises, or counts, had been engaged in perpetual wars with the neighbouring powers, or among themselves; and the assemblies of the states, in return for the supplies of money, which these wars rendered necessary, had obtained such privileges, that their govern-

[24] Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. i. pp. 69—79.

ments approached more nearly to the republican than to the regal form. After several ages, by the failure of the male lines of some of the reigning families, by intermarriages, and by conquests, these countries came successively under the dominion of the house of Burgundy[25] in the interval between the year 1363 and the year 1477. Still however they retained their ancient privileges, the fruits of that commercial opulence, which rendered their prosperity important to their rulers; and a formal confirmation of them[26] was obtained in the latter of those years from the daughter and heiress of the last duke of Burgundy. The reformation[27] indeed having in the year 1518 spread from Germany into the Netherlands, the emperor Charles V. employed for suppressing it various measures of great severity, which were regarded as infringing the privileges of the provinces; but these violences, opposed as they were to a strong conviction of religion, served only to excite that spirit of resistance, which was urged to extremity by the more sanguinary proceedings of his son and successor.

Philip, born and educated in Spain, did not entertain the predilection for the Netherlands, which had been cherished by his father, who had been born in that country, and had passed in it his earlier years. To his haughty disposition the manners of the people were strange and irksome; to his love of power the great privileges, which they enjoyed, were offensive; to his bigotry the free toleration of the new religious opinions appeared insupportable. This last consideration[28] determined him to proceed at once to measures of rigorous coercion. He not only republished, in the third year of his reign, certain most severe edicts against the Protestants, which Charles had been induced to recal; but he also established, for the purpose of enforcing them, a tribunal[29] of the same nature with the Spanish Inquisition, though not distinguished by the same name. To this grand grievance others were added. For supporting the execution of the edicts[30] the number of the bishops was increased from five to seventeen, the number of the provinces, which offended

[25] Watson's Hist. of Philip II., book ii. ch. v. [26] Abrégé de la Hist. de l'Hollande, par Kerroux, tome i. p. 184. Leide, 1778.
[27] Ibid., pp. 210, &c. [28] Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. i. pp. 75, 76. [29] Ibid., p. 77. [30] Ibid.

the nobles, as it augmented the influence of the clergy in the council of state, and the monks and abbots, as it both diminished their importance in the assemblies of the states, and took from them a portion of their revenues for the new endowments. The people also[31], in violation of one of their fundamental privileges, were alienated by the presence of Spanish troops[32], who exasperated the popular discontent by their intolerable insolence and rapaciousness.

William prince of Orange[33], the leader of the revolution, had been[34] during many years the favourite of the late emperor, who had early discovered in him those eminent endowments, by which he has been rendered illustrious. The confidence of the wise and experienced emperor must have given him an early training in the various duties of government; and his favour appears to have given occasion to that fluctuation of religious opinion, which must have disposed him to moderate, as he did, the vehemence of religious parties, and to render the struggle a contest for civil independence, rather than a religious feud. The emperor[35], who had

[31] Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. i. p. 79. [32] The people of Zealand refused to work at their dykes, saying that they chose rather to be swallowed up by the ocean, than to remain a prey to the cruelty and avarice of the Spanish soldiers.—Ibid. [33] As the representative of the family of Nassau in Germany, this prince had inherited several rich possessions in the Netherlands; and by the will of his cousin René de Nassau et Chalons he had in the year 1544 succeeded to the principality of Orange in Languedoc. All these circumstances appear to have been important to his subsequent destination. His German descent gave occasion to that connexion with the emperor Charles V., to which he was probably indebted for much of his peculiar character; his large possessions in the Netherlands, situated as they were in the northern provinces, constituted him the leader of the revolution; and his principality, though belonging to Austria, facilitated a communication with the court of France, to which these provinces in their defection looked for support. The principality of Orange, already seized by Louis XIV. in the war of the Spanish succession, was ceded to France in the treaty of Utrecht by the king of Prussia, in the quality of heir of William III. —Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. p. 313. At this time France, not Germany, was the object of apprehension, and the reason of the combination with the Netherlands had ceased to exist. [34] The emperor kept him perpetually about his person from the year 1544.—Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. i. p. 83. This reminds us of Egbert's residence with Charlemagne, already compared to that of Philip with Epaminondas. [35] Harris's Life of William III., introd. v. Dubl., 1749.

taken him from his father in his infancy, caused him to be educated in the religion of Rome, though born of a protestant family; nor did he, until he was commencing his hostilities against the Spanish government, renounce the tenets of the Roman church. In all respects indeed the prince was eminently qualified for guiding the efforts of his countrymen. Possessing extraordinary resources of patience and wisdom, he watched the progress of events and made preparation for every contingency; regardless of his private interests, and even of the safety of his son, who was detained a prisoner in Spain, he devoted his entire soul to the cause of his country; and he manifested a singular dexterity in conciliating and retaining the affections of men, and in preserving the combination of a confederacy, which, without the influence of his informing spirit, must speedily have been dissolved in its own weakness.

Though the prince of Orange was the grand agent in the revolution of the Netherlands, neither he, nor his friends counts Egmont and Horn, began the resistance, by which it was effected. Without their co-operation a confederacy[36], named the *compromise*, was formed by many of the other nobles to oppose the introduction of the Inquisition, while they disclaimed every intention of resisting the legitimate authority of the sovereign. This effort of opposition, however qualified, was immediately encountered by Philip with a violence, which put an end to every plan of moderation. A numerous army was in the following year sent into the Netherlands under the command of the duke of Alva, a man fitted beyond all others to goad a dissatisfied people into open rebellion, and to coerce their first struggles of resistance into the organisation of a settled government. Even then the prince of Orange deemed the season of hostility not yet arrived, and retired to his county of Nassau in Germany. The government of the duke in the mean time proceeded to prepare the crisis of his interposition. Every outrage, which could be offered to the religious and political sentiments of a nation, characterised the administration of the Spanish governor; and such was its cruelty, that a council[37], which he established, was denom-

[36] Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. i. pp. 175, 176. [37] Of the spirit of this tribunal a judgment may be formed from one of its earliest acts, which was to declare, that to have presented, or subscribed any

inated by the Flemings the *council of blood*, an appellation fully justified, more than eighteen hundred persons having within a few months suffered by the hand of the executioner. The prince himself was soon cited to appear before the duke, and, as he refused to obey, his estates in the Netherlands and Franche Comté were confiscated. In these trying circumstances the wisdom of the prince was conspicuous. Instead of resorting immediately to hostilities, he entreated the emperor Maximilian to intercede with Philip in his behalf, and in that of the oppressed people of the Netherlands, foreseeing that the haughtiness of the king would confirm the alienation of his subjects, and justify his own resistance. At length, in the year 1568, when he had been during some months solicited by the Flemish exiles to take arms, he resolved to begin the war, and with his brother led into the Netherlands some forces, which they had levied in the protestant districts of Germany.

Ten years before this event the death of Mary queen of England, dissolving the connexion with Spain, had left England free to afford a present asylum to the persecuted people of the Netherlands, and afterwards to support in those provinces the cause of religion and liberty. It was computed that[38], about the time of the arrival of the duke of Alva, more than a hundred thousand persons fled into foreign countries, and soon afterwards more than twenty thousand others, who fixed their residence chiefly in that country, rewarding it with the introduction of the Flemish manufactures: and so important was the death of Mary to the revolution afterwards effected, that the historian of Philip II.[39]

petition, against the late erection of bishoprics, or against the edicts and Inquisition, or to have permitted the exercise of the new religion under any pretence whatever, or to insinuate by word of mouth or writing, that the king has no right to abolish those pretended privileges, which have been the source of so much impiety, is treason against the king, and justly merits the severest punishment he shall be pleased to inflict. —Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. i. p. 208. [38] Ibid., pp. 205—208, 275. The art of making woollen cloth had been introduced into England a little before, and about the year 1360, by the Belgians and Flemings, driven from their own country by frequent inundations. On this other occasion the fugitives introduced the arts of weaving the finer stuffs, not only of wool, but also of linen and silk.—Anderson's Hist. of Commerce, an. 1567. [39] Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. i. p. 218.

has declared his opinion, that, if Mary had been still alive, and the Spanish monarch possessed of his former influence over the counsels of England, the people of the Netherlands must have struggled for their liberties in vain.

The first effort of the prince of Orange was soon disconcerted[40] on account of the want of funds sufficient for maintaining his forces; but it served to indicate the deficiency to be supplied, and the infatuated violence, with which the duke of Alva laboured to enforce an oppressive system of taxation[41], soon procured him partisans, disposed to contribute to the expenses of the war. Two years after the first hostilities a numerous party of exiles[42], who had equipped armed ships to cruise against the Spaniards, being at this time by the oppression of the government much increased in number and importance, placed themselves under the authority of the prince, while he, by the assistance of the protestant preachers, was forming a party, and collecting contributions, chiefly in Holland and Zealand, in which provinces the reformed religion had made the greatest progress, and nature and art had combined to construct a secure asylum for liberty.

Elizabeth of England, embarrassed by the movements of her Roman Catholic subjects[43], with whom the Spaniards maintained a secret correspondence, did not for some time feel herself at liberty to avow herself the friend of the exiles, and was therefore necessitated to comply with the requisition of the duke of Alva, by ordering their ships to quit her harbours, and by prohibiting her subjects from furnishing them with shelter or provisions. The historian has however remarked, that this compliance of Elizabeth eventually favoured the independence of the Dutch provinces, as it forced the exiles to depend only on themselves, determining them to seek in their own country that security, which they could not find abroad. If Elizabeth could have been at this time their avowed protector, they would probably have failed to form an independent government.

The war, which was renewed in the year 1572, continued its devastations during thirty-five years, being terminated only in the year 1607, such was the severity of the disci-

[40] Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. i. pp. 237, 238. [41] Ibid., pp. 278, &c. [42] Ibid., pp. 292—294. [43] Ibid., pp. 299, 378, 402.

pline, by which the new republicans were trained for independence. In this long contest two considerations deserve our attention; that of the separation of the seven provinces[44] from the remaining ten, and that of the distinct relations of the two portions.

For estimating the importance of the separation of the provinces, by which ten remained subject to the crown of Spain, it should be considered that the distinguishing character of this period of the policy of Europe, was that the power of the house of Austria should be predominant, so that other governments might be associated to maintain against it their common independence; and that consequently that policy required that, in the division of the two branches of Austria and Spain, some bond of political connexion should still exist, which might strengthen the feeble tie of consanguinity. This connexion was accordingly maintained by that portion of the Netherlands, which still continued to be a dependency of Spain, these provinces being a detached and distant territory not easily protected by Spain, but capable of receiving from Germany prompt and effectual assistance against the attacks of France.

This view discovers to us a double application of these provinces, which may well command our admiration. While the seven were united in an independent republic, which should in the succeeding period constitute the bond of the system, the remaining ten in the existing period preserved the connexion of the two branches of the family of Austria, and supported the actual relations of Europe. This is indeed a repetition of the double agency already traced in the separation of these branches, the one of which maintained the combinations of the earlier period of the federative policy of Europe, and the other prepared those of the period, which should follow. It is however a beautiful instance of analogy, that a corresponding distinction should be discoverable in

[44] Holland, Zealand, Utrecht, Guelderland, Friesland, Groningen, and Overyssell. They extend about one hundred and fifty British miles from north to south, and about a hundred from west to east, comprehending, it is computed, ten thousand square miles. The remaining ten are estimated to extend about a hundred and twenty miles from north to south, and about a hundred and eighty from east to west, comprehending seven thousand five hundred and twenty square miles.—Pinkerton's Mod. Geogr., vol. i., pp. 290, 467.

the division of the dependent territory, which had been before remarked in the separation of the two monarchies. It is further remarkable that, when the earlier period was concluded, and different combinations of policy were to be formed, the Spanish Netherlands were transferred to Austria, to be held as a barrier for the protection of the Dutch republic against the then formidable ambition of France.

The union of all the provinces, as it would thus have been inconvenient to the general policy of Europe, so would it probably have disqualified the new republic for its peculiar function, by giving to it such a degree of intrinsic strength, that it must have been much less dependent for safety on federative combinations, and by rendering it so much a continental power, that it would have been ill fitted for entering into a close connexion of interests with the British government. If on the other hand any of the various negotiations had been successful, by which the people of the seven provinces, in their weakness and despondency, sought a protector against the oppressions of their sovereign, those provinces would have become a mere appendage of some one of the great monarchies of Europe, instead of constituting an independent and enterprising republic, necessitated to seek its safety in the wisdom of political combinations, as it struggled for its soil against the violence of the ocean. Both these extremes were happily precluded. The separation of the provinces preserved the republic from acquiring a territorial and continental importance, which would have been unsuitable to its proper function; and the failure of the negotiations for foreign protection left them to that independence, without which they could not have borne their important part, in arranging the new combinations of Europe.

The separation of the seven provinces[45] was chiefly the result of the greater prevalence of the reformed religion in the northern part of the Netherlands, on account of which they had soon begun to be divided into Protestant and Roman Catholic states. The prince of Orange indeed, in the year 1576, was so far successful[46] in his efforts to unite all the seventeen provinces, that a treaty of confederacy was concluded at Ghent, comprehending all except Luxemburg;

[45] Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. ii. pp. 47, 68. [46] Ibid., p. 12.

but this confederacy, which was named the pacification of Ghent, was really a treaty between the Roman Catholic provinces on the one hand, and those of Holland and Zealand on the other, as between two distinct parties. The difference of local circumstances, and the local influence of the prince of Orange, co-operated with the greater prevalence of the reformed religion, to animate the northern provinces with more determined resolution. The towns of these provinces were for the greater part[47] much more difficult of access by land than those of the others; and at the same time as they were maritime, the Protestants, who had been driven into exile by the Spanish government, being superior in naval strength, were able to maintain by sea an easy communication. The prince of Orange also[48] having been in the beginning of the reign of Philip appointed governor of Holland and Zealand, it is reasonable to believe that his personal influence may have contributed much to excite that superior energy, with which these and the adjacent provinces resisted the oppressions of the crown. A separation was formally made in the year 1579[49], when the union of Utrecht was concluded, the original of the republic of the United Provinces.

Even after the formation of this union[50] the seven provinces, despairing of being able to erect an independent government, looked round for the protection of some of the neighbouring sovereigns, but happily in every instance without success. The emperor and the German princes were utterly averse from taking any concern in the affairs of the Netherlands. The connexion indeed of the two branches of the Austrian family, though it had not hindered the archduke Matthias from accepting the office of governor, before the states had thought of renouncing their allegiance, rendered it impossible for the emperor to countenance their revolt. The same difficulty did not present itself to the duke of Anjou, brother of the king of France, who accordingly accepted the offered sovereignty[51], though under the condition that it

[47] Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. i. p. 304. [48] Ibid., p. 83.

[49] The treaty contained neither any avowal, nor any express renunciation of their allegiance to Philip; but the provinces tacitly assumed to themselves the sovereign authority, and lodged it partly in the general assembly of the states, and partly in the states of the several provinces. —Ibid., vol. ii. p 66. [50] Ibid., pp. 110, &c. [51] Ibid., p. 117.

should not be united to the crown of France. But the situation of France[52] did not permit its monarch to give to his brother any effectual assistance. The finances of that kingdom were embarrassed by the misconduct of the king, and by the calamities of the people: and the struggles of the two religious parties among the French were quite sufficient to exercise the utmost energy of the royal power. Though the aid of France was inconsiderable, and a treacherous attempt of the duke of Anjou[53] to render himself a master of several of their towns had alienated the states, so low were they reduced by the death of the prince of Orange, assassinated by an emissary of Philip, that they offered the reversion of their sovereignty[54], after the death of the duke, to the king of France himself, abandoning their former anxiety for preserving its distinctness from the crown. The internal dissensions of France protected the independence of the new republic by compelling a reluctant refusal. To Elizabeth[55] of England the same offer was then made. The prudent policy of this princess however, while it determined her to give to the confederacy every possible assistance, determined her also to decline the sovereignty of the new state; and by an extraordinary correspondence of circumstances it happened, that her general[56], the earl of Leicester, like the duke of Anjou, outraged her allies by his attempts against their liberties, as if to render it impossible, that the policy of Elizabeth should be warped from her original resolution.

Among the particulars of the struggle, two seem to deserve especial attention. One of these is that the first effort of the prince of Orange was unsuccessfully made with a body of forces collected in Germany, after which the enterprise was abandoned during four years; the other was the assassination of that prince. The bearing of each of these particulars has been distinctly noted. The effect of the former was that the prince[57], who as a German had naturally undertaken to effect the liberation of the Netherlands by land, connecting himself with the marine fugitives of the oppressed provinces, changed his enterprise to a maritime war, and commenced his successes with the reduction of the Brill in

[52] Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. ii. p. 125.
[53] Ibid., p. 138.
[54] Ibid., pp. 204, &c.
[55] Ibid., pp. 211, &c.
[56] Ibid., p. 242.
[57] Tableau des Révol. de l'Europe, tome ii. p. 53.

the island of Vorn, rendering the new republic maritime in its original construction. It has also been remarked of the assassination of the prince of Orange[58], that the Spaniards profited of the consternation, which that event produced among the confederates, to recover many provinces of the Netherlands; and that from that time the general confederacy insensibly decayed, the union of the seven provinces being alone maintained.

The independence of the United Provinces was not recognised by Spain, until the year 1609, eleven years after the death of Philip II.; but the wild ambition of that prince urging him first to attempt the conquest of England, and afterwards to endeavour to acquire France, in the right of his daughter Isabella[59], had so withdrawn his efforts from the reduction of his revolted subjects, that from the year 1591, the war on their part ceased to be defensive, and the ten provinces were preserved to Spain[60] rather by the ability of the Spanish general, the duke of Parma, than by the power of the Spanish arms.

Neither was the prosperity of the United Provinces postponed to the termination of this protracted contest. A vast multitude of manufacturers from the other Belgic provinces, and from France, where the government continued to persecute the Protestants, retired into Holland or Zealand, when the maritime provinces had asserted their liberty. The naval superiority of the states soon afterwards determined them to seek in India the original source of the most lucrative commerce, urged to the enterprise by the restrictive measures of the Spanish government. Early in the sixteenth century[61] the Dutch had actively engaged in exchanging the coarser, but more necessary commodities of the Baltic, for the luxurious produce of Spain and Portugal, the treasures of

[58] Tableau des Révol. de l'Europe, tome ii. pp. 56, 57. [59] The pretension of Philip was founded on his marriage with the eldest daughter of Henry II. of France, the male line of that prince having become extinct in the year 1589, at the death of his youngest son Henry III. When he found that he could not procure the crown for himself, he proposed the brother of the emperor, or any of the princes of the house of Lorraine, offering his daughter in marriage. All his efforts were however frustrated by the conversion of Henry IV.—Suppl. to Mariana's Hist. of Spain, an. 1593. [60] Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. ii. p. 309. [61] Watson's Hist. of Philip III., pp. 178—182. Dubl., 1783.

America, and the spices of the east. Nor was this commerce at first interrupted by the war of the Netherlands, the advantages derived from it to Spain and Portugal inducing the government to connive during many years at the continuance of an intercourse with its revolted subjects. The king of Spain however at last beginning to suspect, that the intercourse was more advantageous to these than to his obedient people, and furnished the resources, by which they were enabled to assert their independence, the Dutch were excluded from the ports of the peninsula, and driven in the year 1595, to seek by a direct traffic with the powers of India, the most valuable commodities of the commerce, which they had lost.

The settlements which the Portuguese had formed in the east, were no longer capable of presenting any powerful resistance to the efforts of the United States. Far removed from the control of their own government, corrupted by the continued enjoyment of prosperity, enervated by an enfeebling climate, and subdued by the artifices and the severities of their ecclesiastical establishment[62], the Portuguese of India were at this time ill qualified to retain the possessions, which their ancestors had so valiantly acquired[63]. The subjection of Portugal to the crown of Spain facilitated and accelerated the loss of these more distant dependencies, for Philip, unable to protect at once all his ancient and his newly acquired settlements, suffered the eastern establish-

[62] The Inquisition was established at Goa in the year 1548, chiefly for subjecting to the see of Rome the native Christians, named the Christians of saint Thomas, who are said to have been about two hundred thousand in number. The archbishop of Goa, partly by intriguing with the native princes, partly by ordaining a great number of new priests, procured an apparent recognition of the doctrine and authority of Rome in a synod convened at Diamper in the year 1599. The Syrian church of India however was not destroyed by this measure, for doctor Buchanan has assured us, that in the year 1806 he found an archbishop of Cranganore presiding over forty-five churches. These Syrian Christians he represents as agreeing with the established church of these countries both in ecclesiastical government and in articles of faith.—Christian Researches, pp. 123, 134. [63] The chivalrous spirit which originally animated the Portuguese, is perhaps most remarkably illustrated by the anecdote of the viceroy De Castro, who to procure money for strengthening the citadel of Diu, pledged his beard to the inhabitants of Goa. The security was accepted, and faithfully redeemed. —De la Clede, tome i. p. 721.

ments of Portugal to fall[64], without an effort to preserve them, into the hands of the Dutch.

The military successes of Portugal had thus prepared the way for the commercial activity of the United Provinces. The traffic of Portugal with the east had been a royal monopoly[65], as the establishment of their settlements had been a great achievement of military enterprise. Such a system must be ruinous in regard to commerce, and could serve only to form stations for a people of different character. Left to themselves, these settlements must have gradually sunk in their own weakness, amidst the hatred which they had provoked; but the subjugation of the mother-country, by exposing them unaided to the attacks of the revolted provinces before the period of their natural dissolution, transferred them to a nation, whose habits were fitted for rendering them the instruments of a beneficial traffic.

The influence of the ambition and bigotry of Philip, in exciting a spirit of commercial enterprise, was not confined to the great trading republic of the Netherlands, but was also exercised on England. By driving thither a multitude of manufacturers he had greatly benefited its domestic industry. He afterwards engaged in an enterprise, which eventually excited its naval exertion. Incensed against Elizabeth for the assistance which she had given to his subjects, and the insults which his dominions in America had received from her fleet; intoxicated with his recent success in reducing Portugal, the maritime power of which country was now added to that of his original dominions; and anxious also to bring back to their ancient reverence for the Roman see a people, which had been during almost thirty years the chief support of the Protestants of Europe, he sent against England in the year 1588 the so-named *invincible armada*[66]. A battle

[64] The Portuguese, in the conclusion of the struggle, retained no considerable place except Goa and Diu.—Mem. sur le Commerce des Hollandois, p. 132. Amst., 1718. [65] Mickle's Diss. prefixed to his translation of the Lusiad. [66] This armament 'consisted of one hundred and fifty ships, most of which were greatly superior in strength and size to any that had been seen before. It had on board near twenty thousand soldiers, and eight thousand sailors, besides two thousand volunteers of the most distinguished families in Spain. It carried two thousand six hundred and fifty great guns, was victualled for half a-year, and contained such a quantity of military stores, as only the Spanish monarch, enriched by the treasures of the Indies and America, could supply.'—Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. ii. p. 258.

was fought, which in its circumstances and consequences may be compared to that of Salamis. The Spaniards were forced to abandon in despair their project of invasion, and what the skill and bravery of the English sailors had left unfinished of the destruction of this formidable armament, was completed by storms and various contingencies. So extensively indeed was the calamity felt in Spain, that Philip judged it expedient to abridge by an edict the customary duration of domestic mourning[67]. The royal navy of England, which had been founded by Henry VIII., and when it had been neglected by Mary, had afterwards been restored and augmented by Elizabeth, was after this triumph very considerably improved in strength and enterprise. In almost every season after the ruin of the armada[68], the English undertook some naval expedition against the dominions of Philip, either in Spain or in America; and in one of these they even captured and plundered the town of Cadiz, where his naval preparations were principally executed.

In the interval between the commencement of persecution in the Netherlands and that of the hostilities to which it gave occasion, the great power of Philip II. was employed in repressing the Ottoman government, which had for this time sufficiently discharged its function of acting externally upon the system of Europe[69]. In the beginning of his reign the Ottoman power was at the summit of its exaltation[70], Solyman, the greatest and the most enlightened of all the sultans, being then in the possession of the throne. This monarch had widely extended his dominions in Persia, in Hungary, and in Africa; he had expelled the knights of saint John from Rhodes, which they had long defended as a bulwark of Christendom; he had stripped the Venetians of a great part of their territories; he had laid waste the coasts even of Italy and Spain; and he had powerfully strengthened the corsairs of Africa, who under his protection had erected the piratical states of Barbary. The first considerable blow, which was struck against this very formidable power, was the repulse which it sustained in the year 1565, at the memorable siege of Malta,

[67] Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. ii. p. 269. [68] Ibid., p. 385.
[69] It acted again in the war of thirty years, and the Turks actually besieged Vienna in the year 1683. [70] Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. i. pp. 96, 97.

where the knights, expelled from Rhodes, had been stationed by the emperor Charles V. In this instance, the power of Spain was but auxiliary, the extraordinary valour of the knights having been previously suffered to break down the impetuosity of the assailants; but, as the apprehension of the danger, to which his forces must otherwise have been exposed, appears to have determined Philip to observe this selfish caution[71], that very circumstance affords a proof of the alarming magnitude of the Turkish armament, and of the importance of a powerful government, interested like Spain in reducing the ascendency of the Ottoman empire. This government, which had thus cautiously reserved its forces at the siege of Malta, put forth all its vigour six years afterwards, when, in conjunction with the pope and the Venetians, it defeated the Ottoman fleet in the great battle of Lepanto. Even after this engagement, in which nearly the whole of the Turkish fleet had been taken or destroyed, the sultan was able, at the end of six months, to send out another fleet of considerable strength. But a fatal wound had been inflicted on the naval power of Turkey; the admiral declined to engage with the fleet of the Christians; and the succeeding sultan, Amurath III., directed his enterprises against the Persians.

Two other operations seem to have been preparatory to that decay, into which the kingdom of Philip sunk, when its functions had been discharged, and its power and activity would but have embarrassed the system. One of these was the ruin of the Moors of Spain, and with them of the industry of the country; the other was a French war, which completed the exhaustion of its finances.

Alarmed by the apprehension of a treasonable correspondence between his Moorish[72] subjects and his foreign enemies of the same religion, this prince resolved in the year 1568 to strip the former of their arms, and to prohibit all those usages, by which a distinction was maintained between them and other Spaniards. The results of these attempts were, that the Moors rose in arms against the government; and that, after a civil war of almost two years, they were overpowered, and reduced either to actual slavery, or to a state of dependence little preferable to servitude. Bigoted however as

[71] Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. i. p. 155. [72] Ibid., pp. 242, &c.

Philip II. was, he was yet too politic to resort to a measure so obviously inexpedient as the expulsion of this industrious people; nor does it appear that the clergy ever recommended it either to him, or to his father[73]. This was reserved for his son and successor, Philip III., who, being influenced much more by bigotry than by policy, sealed in the year 1610 the degradation of his country[74]. It has been remarked[75], that it was fortunate for Philip II., and perhaps for Christendom, that, while he was depressing his infidel subjects, the Turkish sultan would not suffer himself to be diverted from the naval war, which he was then waging against the Venetians. No interposition of that potentate could obstruct the more violent measure of Philip III., for the battle of Lepanto, fought in the year 1571, had ruined the power of the Turks in the Mediterranean.

The French war, in which Philip was engaged during the last eight years of his reign, was the result of a hope of procuring the crown of France, either for himself, or for his daughter Isabella, by taking a part in the domestic dissensions of that country. This, added to his other enterprises, while it served to frustrate his ambition, ruined his resources. His forces were diverted from one expedition to another, and his treasures, great as they were, proved inadequate to his multiplied expenses.

The possessor of the mines of America was at length reduced to a direct bankruptcy. During several years he had been necessitated to borrow considerable sums of money from the Italian and Flemish merchants[76], to whom he mortgaged his revenues. Nearly two years before his death he cancelled these engagements; but his revenues were still insufficient, and his credit was annihilated. Spain, before deprived of religious and civil freedom, weakened by the dismemberment of the Dutch provinces, ruined in the industrious part of its population, and exhausted in the public resources of the government[77], sunk into the imbecility and unimportance suited

[73] Watson's Hist. of Philip III., pp. 296, 297. [74] Book ii., ch. iv. [75] Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. i. p. 256. [76] Ibid., vol. ii. p. 395. [77] How little the Castilian character was at any time adapted to the pursuits of industry, appears from the romance of Lazarillo de Tormes, published soon after the commencement of the reign of the emperor Charles V., and consequently before his wars, or the passion for emigrating to America, could have affected the population,

to a country, the chief relations between which and the rest of Europe thenceforward consisted in managing the brokerage of the mines of America, and in supporting the remaining fabric of the church of Rome. The ruin of the national character was begun with the establishment of the Inquisition, and the expulsion of the Moors was but the completion of the national degradation. Portugal, occupied in foreign enterprises, long escaped the destructive influence of that horrible tribunal; but there also it was established in the year 1526[78], and both in Portugal and India it wrought all its work of intellectual debasement. Brazil, which was saved from its dominion, has, in the great struggle of the peninsula, afforded its protection to the banished government of the mother-country.

Amidst the operation of all these causes of national decay we find the literary glory of the peninsula, because in a nation, as in an individual, the vigour of the intellect outlasts the maturity of the bodily frame, which it informs. The reign of the emperor Charles V. indeed, although fatal to the freedom of the government, presented some immediate excitements to the genius of the Spanish people[79], as it animated their enthusiasm by the brilliant spectacle of national importance, and by the intercourse of the Italians furnished more correct models of composition. This however was a passing influence, soon abandoning the Spaniards to the inevitable decay of mind, which followed, though at some distance of time, the political ruin of their country; and the soft languor of the national poetry has been considered as characteristic of a people[80], which had then survived its liberty, as Theocritus followed the loss of Greek, and Propertius and Tibullus that of Roman freedom.

The literary function of Spain, before this period, had been to convey to the other nations of the west the influences, which it received from the genius and active enquiry of its Arab conquerors. Its peculiar literature it had yet to form, probably because its people had enjoyed little intercourse

wealth, or manners of Castile. In this romance was already displayed that combination of pride, poverty, and indolence, which distinguished the Castilians from the people of Aragon and Catalonia.—Sismondi de la Litt. du Midi, tome iii. p. 292. [78] De la Clede, tome i. p. 669.

[79] Sismondi de la Litt. du Midi, tome iii. p. 267. [80] Ibid., pp. 310, 311.

with other Europeans[81], and therefore received little advantage from the causes, which had among them introduced refinement. The same cause, which appears to have so much retarded the literature of Spain, rendered it more appropriately national than any other, and in particular generated a drama, which disclaims all reverence for the restrictions transmitted to us from the practice of the Grecian theatres. Forming their dramatic poetry before they began to hold intercourse with other nations, and regarding in it only the gratification of their own taste, they entered, in the middle of the fifteenth century, upon a career of this sort of composition peculiar to themselves, when no other modern nation had yet proceeded beyond the mysteries and moralities of the middle ages[82].

The causes, which excited the national genius in the reign of the emperor Charles V., did not merely improve the poetry of Spain, but absolutely changed the versification, by substituting the heroic measure of the Italians for the short verses of the Castilian poetry[83]. The change was effected primarily by Juan Boscan Almogaver, an Aragonian, who probably felt little partiality for the Castilian dialect, as not his own, and on the other hand found the Italian more analogous to that Provençal poetry, in which he had been educated. Boscan was assisted in effecting this literary revolution by his friend Garcilaso de la Vega, who was like him a disciple of Petrarch, imitating however also Virgil and Sannazzaro, and became the first lyric and pastoral poet of his country. Diego Hurtado de Mendoza,

[81] Sismondi de la Litt. du Midi, tome iii. p. 252. [82] The Spaniards refer the origin of their dramatic poetry to three sources; to the mysteries represented in their churches, to a satirical and pastoral drama named Mingo Rebulgo, but most properly to the dramatic romance of Calixtus and Meliboea, or Celestina. The first act of this strange drama was written by some anonymous person towards the middle of the fifteenth century, and manifested a true talent for comedy long before the dramatic compositions of other modern languages. Fernando de Rosas, about the year 1510, added twenty other acts to the first, which was itself very long, and thus rendered the representation impracticable. —Ibid., pp. 255—257. Gil Vicente, a Portuguese, had however in the year 1504 composed a drama in the Spanish language, a religious piece designed to celebrate the birth of a prince of Portugal. He was the single dramatic poet of Portugal.—Ibid., tome iv. pp. 447—449.

[83] Ibid., tome iii. pp. 268, &c.

the last of a triumvirate of the poets of this time, distinguished himself yet more in prose, by publishing, besides a history of the war of Granada, his Lazarillo de Tormes, the first of those comic romances, in which Castilian gravity appears to have sought its recreation, treating with derision that which is mean and profligate in human life. The reign of Charles was fertile in great poets[84]; but a general resemblance prevailed among them, as they all cultivated pastoral poetry. Heroic poetry was indeed frequently attempted by the Castilians[85], and thirty-six epic poems written by them have been enumerated, the most distinguished of which was the Arancana, composed by Alonzo de Hircilla, on the war with the Arancos, the most warlike of the people of Chili. These however were rhymed histories, rather than epic poems, and cannot claim any competition with the productions of Camoens, Tasso, and Milton.

The dramatic literature of Spain is that which is most peculiarly national, and has most attracted the attention of recent critics. Devoting itself to the gratification of the people, and disregarding the rules of the learned, it continued barbarous indeed, but it has caused astonishment by its extraordinary copiousness[86], and in the minds of German critics it appears to have excited by its very irregularity an undue admiration. The great founder of this dramatic literature was Lope de Vega, contemporary to our Shakspeare, having been born in the year 1562, and having died in the year 1635. His dramatic productions are reckoned to have amounted in number to the prodigious sum of two thousand two hundred[87], for each of which, if his entire life had been employed in them, eight days only could be allowed, and time would still be wanted for twenty-one large volumes of poetry, containing among others five epic poems. Calderon, born in the year 1600, is considered by his countrymen as the king of their theatre, and has been ranked by Schlegel in the very first class of poets; very different however from that of the German critic is the judgment of Sismondi, who has pronounced him to have been the writer of a corrupted age, and, though endowed

[84] Sismondi de la Litt. du Midi, tome iii. p. 313. [85] Ibid., pp. 436, &c. [86] Ibid., pp. 362, 363. [87] Ibid., tome iv. p. 46.

with the most splendid gifts of genius, to have passed in every thing the boundary of nature and of truth.

The Spaniards in the seventeenth century were regarded by the principal nations of Europe as the masters of the dramatic art[88]. This admiration however passed away, because their writers, emulating the extraordinary promptness of Lope and Calderon, rejected the aids of study and correction, and reduced their stage nearly to a level with the extemporaneous comedy of Italy. Of the literature of the Spanish theatre generally Sismondi has pronounced[89], that it is defective in substituting complication of plot for exhibition of character, a fault occasioned perhaps partly by the monotony of character in the old romance, to which the national taste had been familiarised, partly by the extraordinary rapidity, with which the Spanish dramas were composed. The effect of this fault, he remarks, is that, though the apparent richness of the Spanish theatre at first creates surprise, yet the ultimate feeling is that of weariness of its uniformity.

The author of Don Quixote, who was born thirteen years before Lope, wrote also for a theatre, but with little success. His fame however can sustain this failure, for he has been immortalised by a romance, which by its irresistible ridicule has closed the series of romantic narrative, and by its faithful representation of characters and manners has become the common and lasting possession of nations.

The literature of Spain supported itself under Philip II., Philip III., and Philip IV.[90]; and, notwithstanding the deleterious influence of national decay, it sunk only with the last of these princes in the year 1665, from which time to the middle of the eighteenth century the people of Spain appear to have remained under the torpor of a mental lethargy. Long however before the end of the reign of Philip IV. it had exhibited indications of a bad taste, which gradually deprived it of its value. Affectation indeed and pretension appear to have been natural to the writers of

[88] The great Corneille formed himself in the Spanish school, and Rotrou, Quinault, Thomas Corneille, and Scarron, gave to the theatre scarcely any except dramas borrowed from those of Spain, the names and manners of Castile even retaining for a long time the exclusive possession of the stage.—Sismondi, de la Litt. du Midi, tome iv. p. 4.

[89] Ibid., pp. 216, 217. [90] Ibid., pp. 217—219.

Spain[91], for the Latin writers of that country from the time of Seneca have been charged with these very faults; the intercourse with the Arabs must also have communicated to them a love of that splendid description, of that daring and extravagant imagery, which in all ages have characterised oriental composition; and when the public freedom had been lost, and with it the freedom of the understanding had necessarily perished, the imagination remained uncontrolled by thought, the single faculty which the national genius could longer venture to exercise. The want of a just taste is accordingly perceptible in the earliest, and in the most flourishing period of the Spanish literature, for it is conspicuous in the works even of Juan de Mena, who died in the year 1456, and Lope de Vega himself sought resources for his amazing fertility of composition in affected expressions, and in images, which a sober correction would have rejected. It was rendered the prevailing characteristic of the Spanish writers by the example of Gongora, who was born in the year 1561, and died in the year 1627.

The corruption of taste appears to have prevailed both in Italy and in Spain from the common operation of the same cause, the loss of that freedom of intellect, which would have controlled the extravagancies of the imagination. Spain seems to have furnished to Italy the example of literary degeneracy; but the latter country aggravated the mischief in the former by a reciprocal communication of evil influence. Marini, who began this corruption in Italy, was a Neapolitan, descended from Spaniards, and educated in Spain; the school, which he formed in Italy, reacted by its example on Spain, where however bombastic pretension and pedantry were indulged to a yet greater excess.

The literature of Portugal[92] appears to have been earlier in its commencement than that of Spain, as the force of the national character began sooner to be developed. The Portuguese writers accordingly assert that the fifteenth century abounded in romantic poets of their country. These however are unknown to the rest of Europe, and the first distinguished poet of Portugal was Bernardim Ribeyro, who died in the year 1521, at the early age of twenty-six years.

[91] Sismondi, de la Litt. du Midi, tome iv. pp. 53, &c. [92] Ibid. pp. 273, &c.

Ribeyro, who probably imitated the Italian Sannazzaro, excelled chiefly in pastoral poetry, which became the favourite poetry of Portugal, even more than of Spain, as the language[93] is a softened dialect of that of the neighbouring country. But Camoens was a splendid exception, the glory and the shame of Portugal[94], as Cervantes was of Spain. His poem, which he has named the Lusiad, or *the Affairs of Lusitania*, and which indeed embraces all the past history of that country[95], has assumed and held a place among the epic compositions of modern nations. Its machinery is however grievously vitiated by incongruity, for, in attempting to support his poem by a pagan mythology[96], the author has rewarded his Christians in an allegorical island of divine love with all the voluptuousness of a Mohammedan paradise,

[93] The Portuguese language may be described as that of Castile deprived of its bones, the middle consonants being generally those which are omitted. Thus *dolor*, grief, becomes *dor; celos*, those, *ceos; nello, no*, &c.—Ibid., p. 265, note. [94] Camoens in the last period of his life was reduced to the misery of subsisting on the alms, which were begged for him in the streets of Lisbon by an old and attached servant a native of Java, a competent fortune, acquired in the east, having been lost in a shipwreck. He died in the short interval between the defeat of Sebastian, and the loss of the independence of his country. Cervantes wrote his inimitable Don Quixote in a prison, in which he was confined for debt. Though the work was admired and extolled by Philip III. and his court, no relief was administered to the wants of the author. Tasso did justice to the merit of his contemporary Camoens in a sonnet addressed to Vasco de Gama, the discoverer of India. [95] Vasco relates to the friendly king of Melinda the previous history of his country, and the remainder, to the time of the composition of the poem, is anticipated in a prophecy, sung by a nymph in the Island of Love. [96] Camoens has endeavoured to justify his use of pagan machinery by a repeated intimation of its allegorical nature. Allegory is however ill assorted with real and substantial personages. Tasso has with more success employed magical enchantment. Milton yet more happily adopted an opinion, once prevalent, that the gods of the pagans were the fallen angels, and has thus been enabled to connect without impropriety a pagan mythology with the events and characters of a Christian subject. Ginguené has placed Tasso next after Homer and Virgil; even above Milton, whom he acknowledges to have been more sublime, but condemns for what he considers as an unfortunate selection of a subject.—Hist. Litt. d'Italie, tome v. p. 462. The German critics on the other hand are enraptured with the romantic poetry of the Spanish peninsula, and Schlegel has preferred Camoens to Tasso.—Lect. on the Hist. of Literature, vol. ii. pp. 108, 109.

and because Bacchus was said to have conquered India, he has placed his Mohammedans under the protection of the heathen god of wine. Prosaic composition was not neglected by the Portuguese, for their heroic enterprises excited the genius of history. A crowd of writers has accordingly commemorated their achievements [97], among whom Barros, a passionate admirer of Livy and of Sallust, has been by his countrymen named the Livy of Portugal.

Camoens died in the year preceding the union, which subjected his country to the crown of Spain. This revolution would have crushed the poetry of Portugal, if it were not already expiring by a natural decay. Bernardos, the contemporary, though also the survivor of Camoens, has proved by his affectation, that a poetry chiefly pastoral had completed its period, the genuine images of this very limited species of composition having been exhausted.

The Spanish peninsula, at the close of the period here reviewed, had fulfilled its great functions in the formation of the system of Europe, and then, as Italy had done before [98], retired as it were into a state comparatively unimportant, leaving the other countries of the west to complete their arrangements without interruption and embarrassment. It seems as if, in the grand drama of the providential government of the world, the several subordinate characters successively withdrew from the public stage of political life, when their respective parts had been performed, to be again brought forward towards the conclusion, and to find their proper places in the general unity of the plan.

[97] Sismondi, de la Litt. du Midi, tome iv. p. 488. Sir W. Scott has ascribed to Vasco de Lobeyra, a Portuguese of the fourteenth century, the composition of *Amadis de Gaul*, which began a new series of romances, approaching more nearly to the modern novel.—Essays on Chivalry, Romance, and the Drama, p. 196. Edinb. 1838.

[98] Camoens, while he laments the growing degeneracy of his own countrymen, describes in strong language the actual debasement of the Italians.—Canto vii. sect. 8.

CHAPTER III.

Of the history of France, from the commencement of the reign of Francis I. in the year 1515 *to that of the reign of Louis XIII. in the year* 1610.

Francis I. king in the year 1515—Civil wars begun, 1562—Massacre of saint Bartholomew's day, 1572—Henry III. assassinated and Henry IV. king, 1589—Civil wars ended and Edict of Nantes, 1598—Henry IV. assassinated, 1610.

The due arrangement of a system of federative policy appears to have required, that the house of Austria should from contingent causes acquire a pre-eminence, which should for a time overbear the intrinsic greatness of France. By the lax constitution of the empire alone could the principles of a federative policy be propagated over Europe; and the maritime dominion, which the Spanish branch of the Austrian family acquired by distant discovery, drew forth the maritime energies of the Dutch and of the English, and thus prepared the enginery of a succeeding period. France, first encircled by the widely extended territories of the house of Austria, and then pressed more especially by the power of Spain, was reduced to a temporary inferiority, very unlike to the grandeur, by which it had been distinguished. To Spain indeed, when separated from Germany, it might have been a formidable antagonist, if religious dissensions had not paralysed its power. It is certain that only the extreme exhaustion, which they had caused, could have hindered it from accepting the proffered sovereignty of the Netherlands, and thus defeating the independence of the Dutch republic.

The interior adjustment of the French government required that some intervals should occur, in which the attention of its rulers might be withdrawn from external concerns, and employed in controlling the domestic struggles of the nation. Two such intervals accordingly did occur; and it is remarkable that the arrangements of the religious and of the political interests of the nation were made in distinct times, instead of being blended together, as in the civil wars of Great Britain and Ireland. In the interval, which was

interposed between the wars of Charles V. and those which preceded the treaty of Westphalia, occurred those civil wars of France, which originated in religious dissension; and in that shorter interval, which intervened between the treaty of Westphalia and the wars of Louis XIV., occurred the brief war of the *Fronde,* which was merely political, and was the concluding crisis of the political agitations of the government. In the British government, in which the two struggles were blended, the religious dissension furnished a strong reinforcement of the principle of constitutional liberty; to the French government this would not have been accommodated, and they were accordingly distinct. It is also remarkable, that these two intervals of domestic contention were well accommodated to the foreign relations of the French government, for its activity, if it could in those times have been exercised on foreign interests, would have occasioned very inconvenient embarrassment. In the earlier of the two intervals the external activity of France would have interfered with those agencies of Spain by which the Dutch republic was brought into existence, and the maritime energies of England were developed. In the latter, if the government had not been occupied by a domestic sedition, it must have been too powerful for the languid resistance of the same government, which had outlasted the great war of Germany, and was terminated only by the treaty of the Pyrenees.

The doctrines of Luther[1] began to be propagated in France so early as in the year 1519, or two years after he had begun the reformation in Germany. In the year 1521 they were condemned by the doctors of the Sorbonne[2], to whom he had appealed; but this censure served only to attract the attention of the public, and from the year 1523 the new opinions found advocates in every class of society. Even when the bishops had begun to pronounce their anathemas, and the dreadful severity of the stake had at last been employed to subdue conviction, the reformers were only driven to seek a protector, whom they found in the loved sister of

[1] Esprit de la Ligue par Anquetil, tome i. pp. 8—13. Paris, 1797.

[2] A college instituted for the study of theology in the university of Paris in the reign of Louis IX. It was so named from its founder.—Henault, vol. i. p. 194, note.

the king. The queen of Navarre was the hereditary adversary of the papacy, the father of her husband having by a papal decree been deprived of the crown of his little royalty[3]. She was also a princess of very considerable endowments, which disposed her to afford protection to the learned men, whom persecution drove into her remaining possessions. Influenced by those, whose genius she respected, and whose unhappy condition she commisserated, she at length embraced the doctrines of the reformation, but was afterwards induced to dissemble, and finally to renounce, her new faith.

The opinions of those who in France embraced the reformation were probably during some years unsettled and various; but in the year 1536, when Calvin had published his celebrated *Institution*, this uncertainty was terminated by the general adoption of his tenets. Francis, anxious to form a political connexion with the protestant princes of Germany, had pleaded in defence of his persecutions, that they were employed only for repressing the extravagance of turbulent enthusiasts; and Calvin published his systematic view of Christian doctrine, that he might repel from himself and his brethren the imputation conveyed in the apology of the king. Calvin indeed does not appear to have been an enthusiast, though of a character very different from that of the German reformer. Not, like Luther, disciplined to the submission of monastic obedience, and gradually by the efforts of an honest and enquiring mind extricating himself from the prepossessions of his early life, but trained to the contentious study of the law, when he had been previously instructed in the philosophy of the age, he combined with his sincere conviction of the genuine truths of our religion a desire of pronouncing a peremptory judgment on the whole plan of the divine mercy. Luther had contented himself with combating the Romish notion of the merit of human works; Calvin proceeded to determine how God decided the everlasting condition of every individual. Nor was the French reformer deterred by any inferences, however alarming,

[3] The decree was issued against him professedly for having adhered to the council of Pisa in the schism of the papacy; really to favour the ambition of Ferdinand of Spain.—Schoepflinus de regno Navarræ, pp. 291, &c. in Comment. Hist. The territory on the northern side of the Pyrenees, being protected by France, remained to the family of Bourbon.

which might be conceived to be deducible from his peculiar tenets, but, rejecting every reserve and qualification, pursued his doctrine boldly through all its fearful details.

The extreme opinion of Calvin appears to have been well adapted to the circumstances of France, in which the Protestants could effect only a partial and temporary establishment[4]. A more moderate system of doctrine might in circumstances thus unfavourable have been after some time assimilated to the prevailing opinions, and lost in the general prevalence of the religion of Rome. The Socinianism also, with which it was connected in its origin, and in which it has ultimately terminated, possessed the advantage of opposing a confident reliance on human reasoning to the mental enslavement of the Roman church.

Francis I., influenced by the repeated representations of

[4] Attempts have been made, especially by the Jansenists, to combine this opinion with the doctrines of the church of Rome; but after a struggle of a century the incongruous effort was suppressed. The struggle began in the university of Louvain, where Michael Baius, a professor, hazarded some assertions on the question of the divine grace. Seventy-nine propositions, extracted from his theses, were condemned by the see of Rome in the year 1567, and again in the year 1579. Baius retracted, but his disciples endeavoured to elude their condemnation by subtleties founded upon the position of a comma. The jesuit Molina, in the year 1598, conceived a system, by which he proposed to reconcile the exercise of free will in man with the operation of the divine grace. This doctrine was by the Spanish Dominicans brought before the court of Rome, but after two hundred conferences the pontiff concluded with reserving to himself the right of pronouncing judgment, when he should deem it proper to do so. Jansenius, bishop of Ypres, occupied twenty-two years in composing a book on the subject. His doctrine however would probably not have travelled beyond the schools of Louvain, if his friend, the abbé de St. Cyran, had not procured for it a favourable reception among the monks and hermits of Port Royal, of whom he was the director and the oracle. The partisans and adversaries of this doctrine began to agitate France in the year 1644. Five propositions were extracted from the large volume of Jansenius, and these, after an examination continued during two years, were condemned by the pope in the year 1653. Though this decree was generally adopted by the clergy of France, and twice confirmed by the papal see, the school of Port Royal maintained their resistance, pleading that they owed to these decisions of the church only a respectful silence, and not any inward belief. The dispute was at length terminated in the year 1668 by the submission of four refractory bishops, who satisfied themselves with secret restrictions. — Appendix to Bossuet's Life of Fenelon, Lond., 1810.

his sister, solicited Melancthon to visit his court[5]. The invitation was not accepted, Henry VIII. of England, in his jealousy of the connexion of the French king with the German princes, having interposed to hinder the journey of the reformer. It had probably indeed been given rather in a spirit of temporising policy, the object of which was to conciliate the German Protestants, than in that of a sincere inquiry after truth, though the king, who by his zeal for the revival of learning had acquired the honourable title of the father of letters, may have been gratified with the idea of inviting to his court a scholar of so great celebrity. If the remark be just, which has been made in regard to the suitableness of the opinions of Calvin to the circumstances of the French Protestants, it must follow that the arrival of the advocate of doctrinal moderation could not have had an advantageous influence on them, unless, which is wholly improbable, he should have been successful in changing the religion of the state. That this is improbable has been inferred even from the anxiety of the king to possess the duchy of Milan, which rendered him desirous of conciliating the favour of the popes. Whatever may have been the motive of Francis, or whatever might have been the effect of the visit of Melancthon, the fluctuation of the conduct of the king was directly conducive to the increase of the new sect, his occasional indulgence inspiring the reformers with confidence, and the severity at other times practised, animating them to cherish those principles, which the arm of power endeavoured to tear from their hearts.

The reign of Francis I. is entitled to our consideration in another and more favourable view, besides that in which it was connected with the reformed religion, as he was the professed friend and patron of learning. The age of this prince is esteemed the first of the three periods of French literature, the others being those of Louis XIV. and of our own time. He accordingly rivalled pope Leo X. in his efforts to introduce among his people a more general knowledge of the ancient classics. With this view Lascaris, one of the most learned of the Greeks, who had fled from the Turkish conquest of their country, was employed by him in forming a

[5] Burnet's Hist. of the Reform. of the Church of England, vol. iii. pp. 110, 111.

library at Fontainebleau[6], and introducing professors of their language into the university of Paris[7]; and Budé, or Budæus, honoured in his own time with the title of 'prodigy of France,' was confidentially employed and patronized[8]. Nor was this reign thus distinguished only by attention to the literature of antiquity, for Marot in this period composed the earliest French poetry, which could in our time be read with ease and gratification[9]. This writer, in his own time the favourite of the great, has been ennobled to posterity by the commendations of three succeeding poets, Lafontaine, Despréaux, and J. B. Rousseau, who acknowledged him to have been the inventor of the ballad poetry, and the first of whom has been indebted to him for the simple graces of his fables. Marot was the inventor of the *rondeau*, and the restorer of the madrigal; but he became eminent chiefly by his pastorals, ballads, fables, elegies, epigrams, and translations from Ovid and Petrarch. At length, either wearied of the vanities of profane poetry, or rather secretly tinctured with the doctrines of the reformation, he attempted, with the assistance of his friend Theodore Beza, and with the encouragement of the professor of the Hebrew language in the university of Paris, a version of the psalms of David into French rhymes. This translation, which he dedicated to Francis and to the ladies of France, was so favourably received, that the printers could not supply copies with sufficient rapidity. In that gay and brilliant court nothing was heard except the psalms of Marot; by each individual of the royal family and of the principal nobility, a psalm was selected, and adapted to some ballad-tune. The psalms of Marot were at length prohibited to the Romanists, because they had been adopted by the reformers of Geneva[10], psalmody and heresy being from that time considered as synonimous terms. The patronage of Francis and the fashion of his court had however furnished the Protestants with the most powerful instrument of the reformation.

Though the early propagation of the doctrines of the Protestants had been favoured by the circumstances of the

[6] Warton's Hist. of Engl. Poetry, vol. ii. p. 413. [7] We find however, says Warton, Gregory Typhernas teaching the Greek language at Paris, in the year 1472. [8] Les Trois Siècles de la Litt. Franc., par Sabatier De Castres, tome i. p. 335. Paris, 1801. [9] Ibid., tome iii. p. 190. [10] Warton, vol. iii. p. 165.

reign of Francis, the form of the government was so very different from that of the German empire, that they could not easily as in Germany, establish themselves securely within any limited district. On the other hand the papal see, involved in a continual contest with the empire, was so careful to manage with prudence the friendship of France, that the abuses of the Romish hierarchy, had never[11], as in England, been urged to an extreme disgusting the understandings and feelings of men, and therefore France was not disposed, like England, to adopt the principles of the reformation as the general religion of the country. All therefore, which the reformation could effect in France, was to give a beginning to a numerous body of sectaries, which after a strenuous contention was suppressed indeed, but not destroyed.

A reformation thus imperfectly successful, appears also to have been all, which the general order of the system could admit in France. By a partial, but authorised establishment of the Reformation, as in Germany, the unity of the government must have been destroyed, and that mitigated despotism could not have existed, which was best adapted to the central and presiding character of France, as best exempting it from the agency of surrounding nations. If again the religion of the Protestants had been adopted as the religion of the state, the connexion of France with the Protestants of Germany, which in the actual circumstances of the former country was preserved with jealousy and suspicion, would have been so intimate and unreserved, as to introduce disturbance and confusion into the relation of the two governments.

The variable policy of Francis I. was succeeded by the steady severity of his son Henry II., who during the twelve years of his reign exerted every effort, though in vain, to extirpate the opinions of the Protestants. As these had already been widely diffused under the preceding sovereign, the unvarying severity of Henry, even more than the occasional violence of Francis, contributed to animate the reformers

[11] The liberties of the Gallican church were secured by Louis IX. in the pragmatic sanction of the year 1269. Another was concluded in the year 1438 by Charles VII. A concordat was for the same purpose concluded by Francis I. in the year 1515.

with the resolution of confessors, and to dispose them to enter into the union of a party. The circumstances of the court of Henry at the same time generated those factions among the great, under which the religious parties of the people were afterwards enlisted. Francis, by availing himself of the jealousies of the grandees of his court[12], had enjoyed the most absolute authority; and he is said to have bequeathed to his son Henry, as his last advice, that he should beware of the aspiring ambition of the family of Guise. The weakness of Henry rendered him incapable of observing this prudent counsel. The Guises governed the king through the influence of his mistress the duchess of Valentinois, while the family of Bourbon, the next in consanguinity to the throne[13], was utterly neglected. This family had been discountenanced ever since the defection of the constable of Bourbon in the reign of Francis[14], but suffered their actual disgrace with the greater impatience, as it seemed to be the work of a mistress and her favourites. The family of Guise, having effected the marriage of Mary of Scotland, niece to the duke, with the young dauphin, acquired yet more influence under the successor, than they had enjoyed in the reign of the father by the mistress. The family of Bourbon on the other hand, by the marriage of their chief with the daughter of the queen of Navarre, that sister of Francis I., who had protected the reformers, became in the very same year engaged in a connexion, which decided its attachment to the opposite party. Thus, while the people of France were arrayed in two adverse parties by a religious dissension, the intrigues of the court provided them with leaders; and the country seemed to prepare itself in all its classes for the vehement struggle, which was to ensue.

[12] Mably, tome iii. pp. 163—165. [13] Louis IX., who died in the year 1270, had two sons; Philip III., from whom descended the house of Valois, and Robert the ancestor of that of Bourbon. The Valesian family received its appellation from Charles, the second son of Philip III., who was count of Valois; Robert married the heiress of Bourbon, which gave the denomination to his branch of the royal family.

[14] The discontent, which caused the constable to revolt to the emperor in the year 1523, has been traced by the historian of Charles V. to the enmity entertained by Louisa, the mother of Francis I., against Anne of Brittany, the queen of Louis XII., who had manifested a peculiar attachment to that branch of the royal family.—Hist. of Charles V., vol. ii. p. 211.

During three reigns of weakness and contention, occupying a space of thirty years, the struggle of religious parties raged with its utmost violence. These were all reigns of the sons of Henry II., and were in their character preparatory to the extinc ion of the reigning dynasty, and the introduction of another family to the throne. The first of these reigns, that of Francis II., was a real, though not for a king a legal minority, this prince having been at his accession only sixteen years old, and the reign being terminated by his death at the end of seven months. Of the second also, that of Charles IX., a great part was a minority, the king having been at his accession but about ten years old; and though his mother[15] caused him to be declared by the parliament of full age before he had completed the established term of fourteen years, yet it was but that he might then transfer to her management the care of the government. The last of the three princes, Henry III., was of full age at his accession, and reigned more than fifteen years; but such was his weakness, that his reign[16] has been denominated 'the reign of favourites.' He appears indeed to have been just such an example of royal imbecility, as is fitted to close a series of sovereigns, and to make room for a new dynasty. The three princes were not however wholly abandoned to their own weakness, for Catherine de Medici, their mother, exercised over them in succession a controlling superintendence. Labouring under a double disadvantage, as a female and a stranger, she could not, with all her ability, give vigour to the royal power; but she was able to soften the shocks, which it sustained from the violence of contending factions.

This superior woman died precisely at the time, when the accession of Henry IV., who began the dynasty of Bourbon, would have superseded her exertions. The accession of this prince is an important epoch in the history of France, both as it affected the external relation of the government to Germany, and as it concerned the internal arrangement of the religious parties of the state. The combination of circumstances, by which a protestant prince was then placed upon the throne, seemed to Davila, a stranger and a Roman Catholic, so extraordinary[17], that he has noticed it as a mystery of

[15] Henault, vol. i. pp. 415, 416. [16] Ibid., p. 432. [17] Davila, Ist. delle Guerre Civili di Francia, pp. 406, 407. Roano, 1646.

the divine wisdom. We, who know the events, which have occurred since the time of the historian, especially the great treaty of Westphalia, may discover in it a portion of the plan of the Almighty's providence.

The state of religious opinion[18] in France did not admit that the royal power should be exercised by a Protestant. But to the commencement of a system of policy adverse to the house of Austria it appears to have been necessary, that a prince should be placed upon the throne of France, who should be regarded as in heart a Protestant, and should feel that his safety depended on the support of the Protestants among his own subjects, and that it was his interest to seek among the Protestants of Germany auxiliaries against that Austrian power, which encouraged and abetted the discontents of the Roman Catholics of France. Francis I., in his great struggle with the emperor Charles V., had sought a connexion with the Protestants of Germany, but could not obtain their confidence, because he was in his own kingdom a persecutor of the reformers. Henry IV. on the other hand, though he had found it necessary to abjure their religion, was not regarded with distrust, and was therefore able to form with them a confidential connexion. After the death of this prince the German Protestants resumed their fears, nor could they be induced to look to the French for assistance, until the death of Gustavus of Sweden had left them without a protestant auxiliary. Even then the renewal of the connexion must have been facilitated, and perhaps could alone have been rendered practicable, by the tolerated establishment of the French Protestants, which had been procured for them by the influence of Henry IV.

If now the religious parties of France had been left to maintain their own struggle without the interference of the factions of the great, the most probable result would have been, that the Roman Catholics would have overborne the Protestants, and these would never have found an opportunity

[18] Bentivoglio reported to the court of Rome, that the Protestants were in the beginning of the seventeenth century only a fifteenth part of the French nation.—Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, chapter xx. note 25. About the year 1676 they were estimated by their adversaries as only 600,000, by themselves as nearly 2,000,000.—Eclaircissemens Historiques sur les Causes de la Révocation de l'Edit de Nantes, tome i. p. 125. 1788.

of placing a king of their own party on the throne of France. But such was the excessive excitement communicated to the Roman Catholics by this interference, that they were urged to proceedings of a violence so extreme, as drove the reigning sovereign Henry III., though a Roman Catholic, to seek support in a connexion with the chief of the adverse party, and to facilitate his succession. The most curious particular indeed in the conduct of the religious war, by which France was harassed at intervals during thirty-six years, was the middle position of the sovereign power. Roman Catholics contended with Protestants, religious associations were formed on both sides, and the league of the former was opposed to the confederation of the latter, while the monarchy seems to have wavered between the two parties, the sovereign at one time declaring himself the chief of that league of the Roman Catholics, which he was unable to control, and at another negociating with the Protestants, to whom it was opposed.

The unexpected death of Henry II.[19] was so critically favourable to the Protestants of France, that these used to speak of it as a special interposition of the divine providence for their protection. Steadily pursuing his plan of eradicating the new sect, he would probably have been successful, if his reign had been continued to an ordinary length; but his career was abruptly terminated by a hurt received in a tournament, and he left for the succession four sons, the eldest of whom was but sixteen years old. From that moment the spirits of the Protestants, commonly distinguished by the name of the Huguenots[20], began to revive; and at the same time those factions of the great began to be distinctly formed, which exasperated the contentions of religion.

In the reign of Henry II. the party of the Guises had predominated, as the king, notwithstanding all his zeal for religion, indulged himself in a licentious connexion, and this family did not scruple to avail itself of the influence of the mistress. His death afforded an opportunity for a struggle, which had been repressed by his vigour. Francis II., weak

[19] Davila, p. 22. [20] Probably derived from that of *Eignots*, given to those citizens of Geneva, who entered into alliance with the Swiss cantons against the duke of Savoy, the latter being an imperfect form of the German word *eidgnossen*, signifying *confederates*.—Mosheim, vol. iv. p. 384, note.

and incapable by nature, though legally qualified by his age to exercise the government, required to be directed by others, and thus became the object of the efforts of the contending parties. The Guises prevailed in this competition, having formed a junction with the queen-mother, the celebrated Catherine de Medici; and the Bourbon family, being thus excluded from the government, sought in the support of the Protestants a strength[21], which might enable them to overthrow their rivals. These, who had hitherto been a party merely religious, and were but beginning to recover their spirits since the death of Henry their persecutor, were thus in the year 1560 induced to enter into a conspiracy, the object of which is stated to have been to surprise the court, and, when they should have killed the duke of Guise and his brother the cardinal of Lorraine, to force the king to commit the government to the prince of Condé, brother of Antony of Bourbon, who should then grant to them the free exercise of their religion. The court however, having received information of the conspiracy, was able to defeat it; and the result was that, instead of advancing the princes of Bourbon to power, the utmost ambition of the duke of Guise was gratified, that nobleman being constituted lieutenant-general with supreme power civil and military, for the purpose of suppressing the malecontents. The Guises soon after brought the Bourbons into their power, and were proceeding to put them judicially to death. But here the hand of God interposed by the unlooked for illness and death of the young king; and the Bourbons were liberated to be the leaders of the Protestants.

The death of Francis II., when he had reigned about a year and a half, put an end to the arrangement made at his accession, and introduced the period of the civil wars, which were begun in the year 1562. The two factions were at this time committed in desperate hostility, and the reign of a child, the king being but ten years and a half old at his accession, afforded a fit opportunity for all their violence. By the death of Francis the Guises had lost that

[21] At an extraordinary council, assembled at Fontainbleau in the year 1560, a petition was presented from the Protestants, for which it was alleged that the signatures of one hundred and fifty thousand persons could be presently procured.—Davila, p. 33.

influence, which they possessed through the aid of their niece, the queen of Scots, whom they had married to the king. The new king being a minor[22], it became necessary that a regency should be constituted, to which the Guises, not being of the royal family, could not regularly aspire. The family accordingly resolved to maintain itself in power by force of arms, which naturally drove the princes of Bourbon to form a contrary confederation. The queen-mother, who assumed the regency, and dreaded alike the ascendency of either faction, endeavoured with great address to moderate the violence of both.

The struggle of these factions, which broke out into open hostility after two years from the accession of Charles IX., was interrupted at intervals by plans of pacification, and in particular, at the expiration of eight years from the commencement of hostilities[23], by one which, besides religious liberty granted to the Protestants, permitted the princes of Bourbon to retain for their security four cities during two years. This agreement was on the part of the Roman Catholics a dark and deep-laid scheme of treachery for drawing the Protestants to the court, where they might be within the reach of the vindictive malice of their enemies. After much and anxious preparation the massacre of saint Bartholomew's day was perpetrated in the year 1572[24], which

[22] Davila, p. 43. [23] Ibid., p. 180. [24] Of the origin and progress of this horrid plot, Anquetil tells us, that the most probable account is, that the original design of the king was to draw the chiefs of the Protestants to his court, with the intention of subjecting them to judicial chastisement for the projects, which they entertained; that the peaceable conduct of the Protestants, and the confidence which they reposed in him, induced the king to abandon this design, and even disposed him to take pleasure in their society; that the queen-mother, whether through religion or policy, was alarmed at these connexions, and formed a union with the Guises, for the purpose of detaching her son from the sectaries; that, to commit the king with the Protestants, an attempt was made to assassinate the admiral de Coligni, one of their chiefs, who had visited the court; and that the king was then persuaded to think, that no middle plan remained for him, but that he must either join with the Roman Catholics for the destruction of their enemies, or expect a new civil war.—Esprit de la Ligue, tome ii. pp. 15, &c. To this dreadful massacre the historian De Thou has (tome iv. p. 600. Haye, 1740) happily applied the words of Statius—

'Excidat illa dies ævo, ne postera credant
Secula; nos certe taceamus, et obruta multâ
Nocte tegi propriæ patiamur crimina gentis.'—Sylv. v. 88.

has for ever dishonoured the annals of the French government. Religious dissension had not there, as in our unhappy country, been embittered by a long preceding series of national animosity; the ignorant populace were not there, as with us, the actors in the bloody tragedy; nor was the massacre the last result of a bigotry, which had in the beginning proposed to restrain itself within the limits of regular hostility, and was afterwards urged on to savage violence. In this instance a sovereign was the murderer of his own subjects, in a time artfully prepared through a perfidious accommodation, and by one sudden, though long premeditated act of vengeance. More than ten thousand persons are said to have perished in the massacre of the capital, which was continued during three days. Orders having been previously dispatched into the provinces, violence was there also exercised against the Protestants, though with very various degrees of severity. The entire number of persons slain within a few days is said to have exceeded forty thousand.

Charles IX. died in the year 1574, and left the kingdom to his brother Henry III., who in the preceding year had procured for himself the crown of Poland, but returned hastily into France, that he might exchange an elective for an hereditary sovereignty. The crafty policy of this prince brought to its issue the movement, which had been begun by the sanguinary bigotry of his predecessor. Perhaps in no other combination of history can we more plainly discover a curious co-operation of the influences of the various characters of sovereigns to the production of a peculiar result. The temporary prevalence of a protestant interest in such a government as that of France was indeed a result, which required a very remarkable adjustment of circumstances. The wavering conduct of Francis I. had accordingly permitted the Protestants to acquire strength, though only as a religious sect; the steady severity of Henry II. had animated them with a spirit of perseverance in their faith, while his weakness permitted their adversaries the Guises to assume a predominance in the government; the feeble and transient reign of Francis II., short as it was, afforded an opportunity for the union effected by the princes of Bourbon with the Protestants, which converted the latter

into a political party; the minority of Charles IX., giving occasion to a more violent contention of the factions of the court, committed the two religious parties in open hostility, at length exasperated by a perfidious and cruel massacre of the Protestants; the yet remaining operation was effected by the artful management of Henry III., which determined the party of the Guises, or the Roman Catholics, to seek in the formation of the great association, named the *league*, a power independent of the crown, and able to control its authority. The preparatory acts of the varying drama were then completed, for the king, when he had first declared himself the chief of the league, was compelled to have recourse for his own safety to that connexion with Henry of Navarre, which procured for the Protestants of France their temporary establishment.

The immediate occasion of the formation of the league was a peace[25], which Henry III. had been induced to conclude with the Huguenots in the year 1576, by which they obtained an entire toleration of their religion, with the right of eligibility to all offices and dignities, an equal share in the constitution of a court of justice in every parliament[26], and eight cautionary towns, to be retained until the articles of peace should have been perfectly executed. The king, either influenced by a principle of piety, or perhaps with a political design of concealing the projected measures of his government, had facilitated the association of the leaguers, by introducing the practice of holding meetings of fraternities for purposes of devotion. Nor did he appear to be dissatisfied, when he was informed that the league had solicited and obtained the protection of the king of Spain, persuading himself that he should be able to establish his own power amidst the struggle of contending factions, and also willing to plead the general discontent of his subjects for annulling the peace recently concluded with the Protestants. These had set the example of seeking foreign aid, by soliciting that of Elizabeth of England, and of the protestant princes of Germany; and it was imitated by the leaders of the league, who on their part sought the protection of the Roman pontiff and the king of Spain.

[25] Davila, pp. 230, 231. [26] There were eight parliaments in France.—Ibid. p. 55.

The party thus associated to overawe the throne, became at length so powerful, that it was determined to offer such terms to the king[27], as should either transfer to them the whole power of the state, or afford a pretext for employing the force of arms to accomplish the same purpose. The king, when he had for some time evaded compliance, was necessitated to acquiesce ; but, when he discovered that the duke of Guise proposed as his ultimate object to be appointed by the states lieutenant general of the kingdom, and thus to be the real and effective sovereign, wearied of his own degraded condition, he determined to free himself from subjection by the desperate expedient of causing his rival to be assassinated, and soon afterwards his brother the cardinal. After this violence no resource remained for the king except in a union with the king of Navarre, who was thus brought into a connexion with the crown, of which he had been during the last five years the nearest claimant in consequence of the death of the brother of the reigning sovereign. Henry III. within a few months fell by the poniard of a bigotted assassin, and thus left the throne open to the pretensions of his new ally.

The influence of these occurrences on the advancement of Henry IV. is not now for the first time assigned, in the refinement of a philosophical speculation on the events of a distant period, but has been long ago contemplated by Davila, as constituting one of the most surprising arrangements of the providential government of the world. To the considerations, which attracted the admiration of the historian may be added that of the assassination of the king[28], which has been mentioned by the historian himself, as having determined the greater part of the Roman Catholics to decline all accommodation with the league, dishonoured as it was by the unjustifiable deed.

The reign of Henry IV. is the period of their history, to which the French nation, so long as they cherished their ancient attachment to royalty, were delighted to look back. The affectionate remembrance of his countrymen has been given to the generous heroism of his character, which seemed to render him forgetful of every personal interest

[27] Davila, pp. 344, 345. [28] Ibid., p. 425.

and solicitous only for the welfare of his subjects. His well-known wish, that every peasant might have his pullet in the pot, though it may be exploded as chimerical by political economists, is characteristic of the benevolent disposition, which has endeared his memory to posterity, and has caused him to be described by the poet[29], as at once the conqueror and the father of his people. Gallant and gay by nature, he interested the feelings of his countrymen as an individual. Formed in the school of adversity to the duties of a sovereign, he exhibited the rare example of a prince, whose energies were excited by difficulty[30], while his compassion for the sufferings of his subjects all the violence of party was unable to subdue. His very faults were of that attractive character, which contributed to fascinate the affections of his people, so that he seemed to be formed alike in his virtues and in his failings[31], for harmonising the discordant passions of civil and religious factions, and reviving in his nation the long forgotten sentiment of political union. If the mingled temperament of various qualities, which fitted him to conciliate the regard of his countrymen, was in any respect unsuited to the serious duties of a prince, the deficiency was abundantly compensated by the grave and steady wisdom of his confidential minister, the celebrated duke of Sully.

The family of this prince seems to have been trained for the issue by a special combination of circumstances. Descended from the royal line of France, and possessing the nearest claim of succession after the reigning family, it was at the same time by a marriage possessed of the little remaining territory of the crown of Navarre[32], which the in-

[29] Henriade, liv. vi. chant 1. [30] In the battle of Yvry, fought in the year 1590, the king commanded that the French, as his subjects, should be spared, while he caused the Germans, who had deserted him, to be destroyed without mercy.—Davila, p. 464.

[31] His facility of temper is indeed represented by Sully, as having done much mischief in encouraging a spirit of disorder among his subjects, so that in the year 1607 it was computed, that four thousand gentlemen had lost their lives in duels since his accession.—Mem. of the Duke of Sully, vol. v. pp. 97, 98. Dubl., 1781. This incidental abuse was afterwards corrected by the rigour of the government. In the irregular manners and violent exasperation of that period, it may have served to divert the minds of the people from political contention.

[32] The little principality of Bearne in France became connected

terposition of the Pyrenees had sheltered from the ambition of Spain, and was thus rendered favourable to those reformed opinions of religion, which had made a considerable progress in the southern provinces of France. The disposition of the sovereign of this petty state to encourage heresy had been pleaded as the justification of a papal bull, by which Ferdinand of Spain endeavoured to sanctify his usurpation of the Spanish part of his territory; and, though the father of Henry IV., who married the heiress of the crown, appears to have wavered between the two religions, yet the young prince himself was carefully educated by his mother in the tenets of the Protestants.

While this other branch of the royal family of France was thus prepared for introducing into the government an establishment of Protestants, the reigning branch was conducted to its extinction, the three sons of Henry II.[33] having reigned in succession without leaving offspring. The family of Guise, unable to dispute the pretensions of the house of Bourbon, endeavoured to avert the succession of the champion of the Protestants, by supporting the claim of an aged cardinal and archbishop, who was nearer indeed to the throne than the king of Navarre[34], but a younger branch of his family. This feeble phantom of a claimant, who was then too a prisoner to the king of Navarre, being quite incapable of making any effort to maintain his cause, his nominal advancement just served to support the right of his family against the pretenders[35], who then aspired to the throne.

But, notwithstanding all these favourable circumstances, the ancient religion was too deeply rooted in the kingdom, to permit that the Protestants should have on the throne a

with the kingdom of Navarre in Spain in the year 1434 by the marriage of the Count de Fois, who then possessed the principality, with the heiress of Navarre.—Etat de la France, tome ii. p. 351.

[33] In almost the same manner the Valesian branch had succeeded to the throne in the year 1328, when the three sons of Philip IV. had died without male offspring. [34] He was a younger brother of the father of Henry IV. [35] In the year 1593 the crown was contested on the one part by the Spanish court, claiming it for the infanta Isabella, as the daughter of Elizabeth, who was sister of the last three kings of France; and on the other by four several princes of the family of Guise.

prince of their profession. The Roman Catholics of the army[36], which the king of Navarre commanded at the death of Henry III., determined to support his pretension only on receiving an assurance, that he would embrace their faith. He accordingly found himself necessitated to promise, that he would within six months cause himself to be instructed, and, if it should be necessary, would submit himself to the decision of a national council; nor did he obtain possession of his capital, until he had in the year 1593 abjured the protestant faith, when he had long anxiously deliberated between his fear of the opposition of the Roman Catholics, and his apprehension of losing the support of the Protestants, both of France and of foreign countries.

Of the reign of Henry IV., which comprehended twenty-one years, nine years were employed in overcoming the resistance opposed to his elevation, the struggle of the civil wars not being concluded until the year 1598; the remainder was only sufficient for healing the wounds of a country, which had suffered from so long and so violent a contention. The struggle between the two sects was in that year terminated by the edict of Nantes[37], which drew a line of demarcation between their respective pretensions, granting a large allowance of privileges to the Protestants, though bestowing on the Roman Catholics the superiority belonging to the religion

[36] Davila, pp. 424—426. [37] This edict, consisting of ninety-two general and fifty-six particular articles, granted to the Protestants the public exercise of their religion in certain specified places, the Roman Catholics however having also in these places the same liberty; the enjoyment of all the rights of citizens, with eligibility to all offices; the establishment of chambers of justice, one half of the members of each of which should be Protestants; permissson to hold synods under the superintendence of royal commissioners; the power of levying money for defraying the expenses of synods and of the maintenance of ministers, in addition to a royal allowance granted for the latter purpose; and, as security, the continued occupation, during the eight ensuing years, of all the places then in their possession, exceeding two hundred in number, with the liberty of maintaining garrisons in them, and an annual payment from the government for the support of the troops.—Laval's Hist. of the Reform. in France, vol. iv. pp. 197—293. Lond. 1737—1741. The prosperous state of the Protestants continued to the peace, which followed the reduction of Rochelle in the year 1629. From this time they were subjected to continually increasing restrictions, and in the year 1685 the edict was recalled.—Esprit de la Ligue, tome iii. p. 350.

of the state. The arrangement indeed was evidently of a temporary nature. A republican confederacy possessing fortified places was constituted within the monarchy; the government was accordingly from this time composed of two parts, different in religious principles, and mutually opposed in political interests; and it was inevitable that one of these should after some time prevail over the other, and establish itself exclusively under the protection of the government. The situation of parties was however much changed, for the struggle of the Protestants was, not with the league, but with the crown. The nation was disgusted at the excesses, from which it had suffered so many calamities; the Menippean Satire[38] had covered the league with ridicule, as the protestant sectaries of England were afterwards rendered ridiculous by the satire of Butler; and no third party could again be formed among the people, to controul the sovereign, while it pretended to maintain against heretics the religion of the state.

Though Henry felt that the power of Spain had been actively and perseveringly exerted in opposition to his interest, he perceived the expediency of entering into a negotiation with the government of that country, and a peace was accordingly concluded in the year 1598 by the treaty of Vervins. Still however the apprehension of the power of the house of Austria rankled in his heart, and his last meditations were employed in preparing the execution of a project, by which it should be for ever so controlled, as to be incapable of disturbing the tranquillity of Europe. The details of this plan[39] have been communicated by Sully, who has informed us that the king had entertained it even from the time, when he was struggling to maintain his right of succeeding to the throne; but he has added that, if it had not been suggested to him by Elizabeth of England, it had however been long before contemplated by that princess. Henry formally proposed it by letter to Elizabeth in the year 1601, when the queen came to Dover, and the king to Calais, for

[38] The Menippean Satire consisted of two parts, one of which was named the Spanish Catholicon, the other the Abridgment of the States of the League. The former was the work of one person; the latter was the joint production of many.—Henault, vol. ii. p. 14. [39] Memoirs, vol. vi. pp. 71, &c.

the purpose of a more free communication; and it was afterwards yet more explicitly submitted to her by Sully himself. The death of Elizabeth, which occurred in the year 1603, gave a shock to the scheme; but Henry still persisted, and by a second embassy of his confidential minister obtained from her successor a passive concurrence, with a zealous assurance of co-operation from the prince of Wales. The arm of an assassin arrested the enterprise at the moment of execution[40], and left the interests of Europe to their gradual progress towards the arrangements of the peace of Westphalia.

This memorable project proposed in the first place to divest the Austrian family of the empire, and of all its territories in Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands, but granting to it, with the kingdom of Spain, Sardinia, Majorca, and Minorca, together with its insular territories in the Atlantic, and all its dominions in Africa, America, and Asia, and even all which might afterwards be discovered and acquired in those

[40] The death of the duke of Cleves, which occurred in the year 1609, afforded the occasion. The duchy, having been formed by a successive union of six small provinces, Cleves, Juliers, Berg, La Marck, Ravensburg, and Ravestein, involved such a complication of claims, that as Henry remarked, the succession belonged to almost all Germany. The whole however was claimed by the emperor, who maintained that none of these provinces could descend to female heirs. To France it was very important that they should be held by friendly princes, and such a disposition would have greatly weakened the power of Austria. While Henry wavered about the commencement of his grand project, the German princes held an assembly at Hall in Suabia, to which the Venetians, the prince of Orange, the states of Holland, and the duke of Savoy sent deputies; and it was there determined to send an embassy, soliciting the assistance of Henry in opposing the usurpations of the emperor. In the spring of the year 1610, the troops were sent forward, and the king gave the signal of his own progress by a letter addressed to the archduke, announcing an intention of marching through the territories of that prince, and requiring to be informed, whether he should be received as a friend or as an enemy.—Mem. of Sully, vol. v. pp. 231—267. The dispute of this succession was not finally settled until the year 1666, when, by the mediation of France, the duchy of Cleves, with the counties of La Marck and Ravensburg, was adjudged to the elector of Brandenburg; the duchies of Juliers and Berg, with a part of the county of Ravestein, were given to the duke of Neuburg; and the Dutch retained Emmerick, Rées, Wesel, Orsoy, Gennep, and some other places, in the former division, with the city of Ravestein and its dependencies in the latter.—Hist. de Hollande, par M. de la Neuvile, tome iii. p. 289. Paris, 1693.

distant regions. It was next proposed that the imperial dignity should become purely elective, and that the emperor should be declared the first magistrate of the whole Christian republic; that the Austrian territories should be distributed among the neighbouring princes and states; that Bohemia, Hungary, and Poland should be enlarged and strengthened, and that these should all be elective kingdoms, the electors for Hungary and Poland being the pope, the emperor, and the kings of France, England, Denmark, and Sweden, and a new potentate to be denominated king of Lombardy; that Swisserland, which should be augmented by the addition of some adjacent territories, should be united into a sovereign republic under the arbitration of the emperor, the princes of Germany, and the Venetians; that the pope should receive all the southern provinces of Italy, and be entitled the immediate chief of the whole Italian republic, comprehending also Genoa, Florence, Mantua, Modena, Parma, Lucca, Bologna, and Ferrara[41]; that Lombardy, the Milanese, and Montferrat should be added to the possessions of the duke of Savoy, who should be distinguished by the title of king of Lombardy; and that a Belgic republic should be constituted of all which should remain of the seventeen provinces of the Netherlands, when certain specified districts should have been formed into principalities. In this manner it was designed, that the number of European powers should be fifteen, of which six should be great hereditary monarchies[42], five elective monarchies, and four sovereign republics; and that the general interests of Europe should be adjusted by a council, composed of about sixty-six persons[43], to be triennially elected.

[41] Genoa, Florence, Mantua, Modena, Parma, and Lucca, were not to undergo any alteration of their governments, but Bologna and Ferrara were to be rendered free cities. All these were once in every twenty years to render homage to the pope as the chief, by presenting a crucifix worth ten thousand crowns. Sicily was to have been ceded to Venice, on the condition of homage to be rendered for it to every pontiff.—Mem. of Sully, vol. vi. p. 86. [42] The six hereditary monarchies were to be France, Spain, England or Britain, Denmark, Sweden, and Lombardy; the five elective, the empire, the papacy, Poland, Hungary, and Bohemia; the four republics, the Venetian, the Italian, the Swiss, and the Belgic.—Ibid., pp. 88, 89. [43] Henry was of opinion that it should be composed of four commissaries from each of the following powers; the emperor, the pope, the kings of

It is probable that this project of Elizabeth and Henry embraced all, which human wisdom was then capable of devising, for securing the independence, and maintaining the tranquillity of Europe. It was most natural that these sovereigns, who had both been harassed by the power of Spain, should regard the reduction of the Austrian family as the main and most important consideration in such an arrangement. But when we examine their plan at the distance of two centuries, availing ourselves of our knowledge of the events, which have occurred in that most interesting interval, we may discover that it was ill adapted to their purpose. The first and most obvious objection is, that the grand object of the project was the reduction of the power of Spain, already exhausted by the very exertions, at which Elizabeth and Henry had conceived so much alarm. The plan accordingly proposed chiefly to effect that, the necessity of which had ceased to exist. In the next place, that it might receive the concurrence of the Roman pontiff, the plan proposed to give to him so much temporal dominion, as would have too much secularised the papacy, and thereby have much impaired its ecclesiastical character. If moreover it had been carried into execution, it must speedily have ceased to retain the governments of Europe in their proposed combination, because that combination would have been, by its very adjustment, destitute of the necessary maintaining power, the dread of some overwhelming dominion. In the last place, it would have obstructed, instead of assisting, the progressive adjustment of the interests of Europe, as they have been actually arranged. The powers of Europe were then tending towards an adjustment, in which Austria should be the predominating, and France the rival, or balancing power; but this project would have taken away the dominion of the house of Austria in Germany, where the adjustment was in progress, and would thus have precluded the arrangement. Such, and so limited, is the wisdom of the wisest of mortals!

It is remarkable that the civil wars of England and France were directly contrasted in their respective influences on the

France, Spain, England, Denmark, Sweden, Lombardy, and Poland, and the republic of Venice; and of two from each of the other republics and the inferior powers.

commercial habits of the two nations. In England the interregnum formed an important period of the commercial history of the country; in France the war of the league withdrew the attention of the nation from its marine, and annihilated its foreign commerce. The English commotions, being about eighty years later than those of France, had been preceded by the naval glories of the reign of Elizabeth, which had determined the direction of the public energies, and were contemporary to the commercial greatness of the new republic of the Dutch provinces, which excited the rivalry of the state. No such circumstances having influenced the earlier commotions of the French, the two neighbouring kingdoms appear to have experienced opposite effects from nearly similar causes, and thus to have been diversely disposed to assume their respective stations in the general system of Europe, France as the power controlling the interests of the continent, England as that which opposed to its predominance the strength supplied by maritime resources.

In another respect also, unhappily for France, do the two periods of public agitation appear to have been directly contrasted. In England the serious principles of the Puritans, however pushed to extravagance, seem to have imparted to the national manners a strong influence of moral regulation, which has been perhaps usefully moderated by the counteracting influence of the voluptuous court of Charles II., but has continued to the present day to maintain among the people a high standard of the public morals. In France, where an opposite influence was widely predominant, the national morals appear to have reached, in the period of the civil war, the last stage of a progressive depravation, from which they have not yet receded. The factitious principles of chivalry had lost their power, and the genuine principles of religious reformation had not been sufficiently introduced into their place. It accordingly appears[44] that before the reign of Charles IX. the men had indeed seduced the women into that vicious intercourse, to which French licentiousness has given the name of gallantry, but that in the time of that prince, irregular amours having become involved in all the political intrigues of the state, the women became the

[44] Abrégé Chron., tome vi. pp. 328, 329.

seducers, their husbands acquiescing in their profligacy, through interested speculation, or because they were gratified with the compensation which they found in the general licentiousness, each husband receiving from it, in the place of one wife, a hundred. In the succeeding reign of Henry III. cruelty was added to licentiousness, the horrid massacre of saint Bartholomew's day having awakened and encouraged all the malignant passions; and the mixed subjects of gallantry and violence occupied all the thoughts of the young nobility of the kingdom, constituting even their system of education. More peaceable times brought with them more peaceable habits, but the disregard of conjugal obligations has continued to be the disgraceful characteristic of French society. This corruption, however to be deplored in a moral view, has indeed qualified the French to give to the nations of Europe an example of that amenity of manners, which would bestow a grace on virtue, and can almost cause the want of it to be forgotten. At some future, possibly at no distant period, the influence of the example of our own country may perhaps dispose the neighbouring people to combine the religion and morals of England with the manners of France, and become at the same time virtuous and attractive.

CHAPTER IV.

Of the histories of Russia and Poland, from the commencement of the sixteenth century to that of the German war of thirty years in the year 1618.

Siberia acquired by Russia in the year 1581—The Russian church independent, 1588—The crown of Poland simply elective, 1579—Poland united with Sweden, 1592—The union dissolved, 1604.

The four governments of the north of Europe, Russia, Poland, Denmark, and Sweden, with the dependent state of Norway, are reducible into two divisions, one of which should comprehend Russia and Poland, the other the more western countries. These were occupied by the German

nations, who had preceded the Slavians in their progress into Europe; Russia and Poland, on the other hand, were occupied by the Slavians, who possessed themselves of the countries, which the Germans had abandoned.

Russia was too remote, and its government was yet too imperfectly formed, to exercise in this period any direct influence on the combinations of the system of Europe; and therefore, if its immediate agency were alone to be regarded, the consideration of this state should be reserved for a subsequent portion of the investigation. Poland however was in both respects differently circumstanced, and in the German war of thirty years did actually take a part in adjusting the general arrangements of European policy; and, as Russia was so closely connected with Poland, that these two governments may be considered as forming a distinct combination of states reciprocally affected with various influences, it appears necessary to consider them conjointly, the one as directly acting on the federative adjustment of the policy of Europe, the other as being intimately connected with the former in all the relations of vicinity, of a common origin, and of a common language.

Before the beginning of the sixteenth century Russia had been finally rescued from the thraldom, in which it had been long held by the Tatars, and the ascendency of the sovereign power had been established by a vigorous and enlightened monarch. Poland at the same time had been strengthened by the important accession of Lithuania, the incorporation of which with the Polish government was then nearly perfected, after the lapse of more than a century from its commencement; but the government was gradually assuming more of the character of an elective monarchy, and was thus preparing itself for its subsequent decay and dissolution.

The admiration deservedly bestowed on Peter the Great, for his extraordinary efforts to civilise and aggrandise his people, has given occasion to an erroneous conception of the prior situation of his country. We are accustomed to imagine a genius of a superior order arising among a people, who had made scarcely any progress from the rudeness of a savage life, hurrying them with the rapidity of enchantment through the long interval, by which such a people

must be separated from civilisation and importance, and introducing at once into the system of Europe a new member, sufficiently powerful to influence all its movements, and to control all its operations. This sudden transformation of a great society does not however lie within the ability of the most exalted talents; nor is it any disparagement of the genius of Peter to say, that he did not do that, which human energy must be unable to accomplish. The habits of a nation, as of an individual, must be formed by degrees. It has accordingly been shown of the Russian government[1], that even in the reign of that prince, who rescued it from the dominion of the Tatars, a beginning was made of the efforts, to which Russia has been indebted for civilisation and refinement, artists having been even then attracted from Italy.

Ivan III., who had delivered his country from slavery and debasement, and had endeavoured to ennoble his government by the introduction of the arts of cultivated life, had marked his greatness by assuming the title of grand prince of Russia[2]; and his son and successor, who began his reign in the year 1505, characterised in the like manner his increasing aggrandisement by adopting the new title of czar, or sovereign[3]. This reign was distinguished by the successful energy, with which the renewed strength of the government was exerted in recovering from the Poles the territories, of which they had possessed themselves during its subjugation[4]. In an interval of external tranquillity that energy was also employed in repressing the republican turbulence of one of the great cities of Russia, and in simplifying and strengthening the administration[5].

The succeeding sovereign Ivan IV., whose reign occupied fifty-one years in the middle of the sixteenth century, from

[1] Book ii. chap. viii. [2] His title, fully expressed, was grand prince of Volodimir, Moscow, Novgorod, and all Russia; a title indicating the imperfect consolidation of the government. [3] The emperor Maximilian, in a confederation against Poland, gave Vassili IV., then sovereign of Russia, the title of emperor. From the middle of the sixteenth century the English gave this title to the sovereigns of Russia, and other powers have followed their example.—Levesque, tome ii. p. 381. The title of czar was first borne with constancy by Ivan IV.—Ibid., tome iii. p. 20. [4] Ibid., tome ii. pp. 371—381.
[5] Ibid., pp. 373, 374.

the year 1533 to the year 1584, is described to us by the historian of Russia[6], as having contributed more than any of his predecessors to the power of the nation. The ferocious character of this early improver of Russia is a curious object of attention, resembling the rough violence of the celebrated Peter, but exceeding it proportionally in degree, as it operated on the country in a considerably earlier period. Having succeeded to the throne when only three years old, he was necessarily subject to the control of others during a long minority, and exposed to all the wrongs, which avidity might practise on the weakness of childhood in an unsettled government; but his spirit afterwards rose with indignation against the usurpations, of which his earlier years had been the prey[7], and when scarcely fourteen years old, he assumed the government with an authority, which at once reduced the intrigues and factions of the court to silence and submission. The discipline of this noviciate appears to have aggravated the stern severity of his original character[8]. By some historians he has been pourtrayed in the colours of a cruel tyrant, but a series of important measures attests the utility of his energetic government. For repressing the efforts of the Tatars he instituted the *strelits*[9], the first regular troops of Russia, arming them with muskets instead of bows, which had been almost exclusively employed. With this force he effected the ruin of the neighbouring hordes of Tatars, which had continued to infest Russia, ever since that country had been subject to their nation; and the importance of this achievement to his internal government he boldly proclaimed to his courtiers, in telling them that God had at length strengthened him against them. To supply the deficiencies of his subjects, he invited from various parts of Europe persons capable of instructing them in the arts of life, of accustoming them to subordination, of forming them to the practice of regular war, and leading them to battle[10]. With a barbarous vengeance he subdued the refractory spirit of the Russian cities, to the ruin indeed of the celebrated Novgorod, the parent-city of the government, sustaining at the same time the

[6] Levesque, tome ii. p. 391. [7] Ibid., tome iii. p. 17. [8] Ibid., p. 18. [9] Ibid., pp. 29, 52, 53. [10] Ibid., p. 73.

united attacks of all the neighbouring nations, amidst appearances of danger so formidable, that our queen Elizabeth deemed it necessary to offer him an asylum within her territories. A fortunate contingency bestowed on this extraordinary reign the splendour of enlarged dominion[11], by opening the way to the acquisition of Siberia, a region more extensive than the original territory. Nor should it be omitted that in this reign also, in the year 1553, the way to the White Sea was discovered by the English[12], and a commercial intercourse was thereby opened between their country and Russia.

Levesque, when in his history of Russia he had recited the military events of the reign of Ivan IV., has added that he must proceed to describe this prince as the legislator of his country, and the protector of commerce and the arts, and that it would then only remain to compose a history of him as a savage beast. But the Russians his subjects[13] were at this period savage in their manners, and the historian[14] has quoted the acknowledgment of a Russian writer, that the actual habits of the nation may have required such a government. The poignant description of the efforts of Peter, that they were the action of aqua fortis upon iron, may indeed with yet greater propriety be applied to those of his predecessor. This savage civiliser of a savage people, with a fanaticism, which must bring to our recollection the character of the Russian Suwarrow in the war of the French revolution, impressed his subjects with a persuasion[15], that he acted under the influence of an inspiration from heaven, from which alone he affected to derive his authority. When he was solicited to grant a favour, his answer was that he would do so, if God should so ordain. His subjects accordingly, in all the extravagancies of his folly or barbarity, learned to reverence the sanctity of his actions, as divinely directed; and the historian has supposed, that at this time began the custom, which prevailed

[11] A chief of the Cossacks of the Don, in the course of his depredations, possessed himself of Siberia in the year 1580, and apprehending that he should not be able to retain his conquest, ceded it in the following year to his sovereign, who had been ignorant of the enterprise.—Levesque, tome iii. p. 134. [12] Ibid., p. 154. [13] Ibid., p. 101. [14] Ibid., p. 168. [15] Ibid., p. 166.

among the Russians, of saying, when they would profess their ignorance of any thing, God knows it and the czar.

The remainder of the sixteenth and the first four years of the seventeenth century were occupied by two reigns, the former of which concluded the earlier dynasty of the Russian sovereigns; but, as the feeble sovereign, who closed the succession of his family, suffered his brother-in-law[16], by whom he was succeeded, to govern himself and his dominions, they may both be considered as one reign of twenty-one years, during which the superior ability of the latter monarch was vigorously exerted in prosecuting the designs of Ivan IV. Boris accordingly, the founder of the new dynasty, employed himself through that entire period in inviting from foreign countries[17] those, whom he thought capable of instructing the Russians, in availing himself[18] of every opportunity for promoting the commerce of the country, in improving[19] to the utmost of his power its soldiery and military defences, and in yet further reducing those distinguished families, which gave umbrage to the dignity of the throne. Already, says the historian[20], might the nation expect to see the arts of war and peace flourish in its bosom; already had it attracted the attention and consideration of the more improved governments of Europe; and even the haughty Elizabeth of England deemed it desirable to cultivate the friendship of this distant, and hitherto obscure people.

To this account of the general progress of Russian improvement in the sixteenth century it should be added, that towards the conclusion of that century, or about the year 1588, the church of Russia[21] experienced a revolution in some degree analogous to that ecclesiastical separation among the other states of Europe, which had there withdrawn the Protestants from the supremacy of Rome.

At that time the metropolitan of Russia was raised to the dignity of a patriarch, and the church of that country was thereby rendered independent of the patriarch of Con-

[16] Levesque, tome iii. p. 217. [17] Ibid., p. 239. [18] Ibid., p. 253. [19] Ibid., p. 254. [20] Ibid., p. 259. [21] Ibid., p. 217. Hist. de l'Anarchie de Pologne, par Rulhière, tome i. p. 106. Paris, 1807.

stantinople, to whom it had been subordinate, as the rest of Europe had been subjected to the Roman bishop. But this revolution of the Greek was far inferior to that of the Roman church in the dignity of its origin, as in the importance of its consequences. It was not the struggle of awakened reason, for such was the ignorance of the Russian clergy[22] in the middle of the sixteenth century, that three persons only among them were acquainted with the Latin language, and none of them had any knowledge of the Greek, though they belonged to the Greek church. Nor was it the resistance of the virtuous feelings of mankind, indignant at gross practical abuses, for the Greek patriarch, who had never been able to establish an authority equal to that finally erected by the Roman pontiff, had been more than a century involved in the general ruin of his country, and the Russian prelates appear, from the unexceptionable testimony of a Romish jesuit, to have attracted universal veneration by the exemplary regularity of their conduct. It was the simple result of the oppressed and degraded situation of the church of Greece[23], and was proposed, or conceded, to

[22] Levesque, tome iii. p. 163.

[23] The church of Greece neither possessed the power of committing so great abuses, as in that of Rome provoked the reformation, nor the countervailing principle furnished by the doctrine of Augustin, which was confined to the Latin church. An attempt was made by Cyril Lucar, patriarch of Constantinople, who had passed some time in England in the reign of Charles I., to introduce a reformation on the principles of Calvin; and we have a confession of faith, which he composed for this purpose in the year 1621. But the Greek church was not prepared for such a measure; and the church of Rome on the contrary acquired an influence in it, which caused the opinions of Cyril Lucar to be condemned by two synods, one held in Constantinople in the year 1639, the other at Jassy in Moldavia in the year 1642, and by a council assembled at Jerusalem in the year 1672. The influence of Rome, a natural result of the Italian education of the more learned among the Greek clergy, has introduced among the later Greeks the doctrine of transubstantiation, which had originated in the Latin church.—Monumens Authentiques de la Religion des Grecs, par Aymon. Rycaut's Present State of the Greek church, pref. The church of Greece, with that of Armenia, which was originally a part of it, is represented by Rycaut as, in the latter part of the seventeenth century, retaining only the exterior of religion, and depending more on the rigorous observance of long and frequent fasts, than on the spiritual influence of religious principle. The influence of Rome had, at least three centuries and a half before

the czar by its pontiff, as the means of conciliating his favour and procuring some assistance.

The pretext of the new arrangement is curious, and forms some sort of connexion with the history of the rest of Europe. It was alleged that of the five chiefs of the Christian church, namely the bishop of Rome and the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, and Jerusalem, the first had fallen from his rank by various heresies, and that it was expedient that his place should be supplied by a patriarch of Russia. Thus, when a large portion of the west had separated itself from the jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff, the Greek patriarch also pronounced against him his feeble sentence of degradation, and in the pride of superior orthodoxy sought a pretext for renouncing a superiority, which he was no longer able to maintain.

This ecclesiastical revolution tended to introduce some disturbance into the simple despotism of the Russian government, as it gave importance to the clergy, who had been before too humble for ambition. The chief of the church[24] advanced his pretensions to power; the great families began to introduce some of their members into the ecclesiastical order; and the absolute rule of the czars began to feel, that there was in the state a countervailing authority. Peter the Great at length remedied the inconvenience by suppressing the patriarchate, while he preserved the independence of the church of Russia; and thus the sovereign of Russia, like the king of England, constituted himself the supreme head of the ecclesiastical establishment of his country.

The progress of Russia was at length interrupted, though but for the short space of eight years, in which interval however the country experienced all the mischiefs of internal distraction, and was thereby exposed an unresisting victim to the aggressions of the Poles. It is in giving occasion to this disturbance and suffering of Russia, that we perceive the influence of that termination of the ancient dynasty, which had just before occurred in the government. Boris, the aspiring author of the revolution, had employed

the time of Rycaut, been extended to Armenia; but this writer denies, that the Armenian church had ever conformed to that of Rome, or admitted the supremacy of the pope. [24] Rulhière, tome i. p. 107.

assassins to murder the infant brother of the preceding sovereign, and thus to remove the single impediment, which obstructed his own advancement, Unhappily for Russia, this act of violence was involved in so much obscurity by the policy of him who had directed it, that the death of the young prince[25] was not ascertained to the conviction of the public, and a series of persons claimed the throne under his name, and. assisted by the intrigues and forces of Poland, carried confusion and desolation into the heart of the country.

The death of Boris, after a short reign of seven years, made room for this scene of public confusion, which obscured for a time the bright prospects of Russia. Fedor II., his son and successor, being but a youth of sixteen years, was utterly unable to contend with the difficulties of his situation. His murder accordingly within a year avenged the violence, if not actually offered, at least intended for the young Dmitri, or Demetrius, and placed on the throne a person, who claimed to be that injured individual. The strong antipathy entertained by the Russians against the Poles, by whom this claimant had been supported, and their jealousy of the manners of Poland, which he had adopted, soon excited a violent fermentation in the minds of his people. A conspiracy was at the same time formed against him by a prince of the royal family of Russia, and in the following year another murder made way for another sovereign. The reign of this czar, which lasted only four years, was agitated by every disorder, which could convulse a government. The unrelenting vengeance of the new sovereign exasperated those, who had been adverse to his exaltation; the peasants availed themselves of the public confusion, to attempt the overthrow of the nobles; seven different impostors, each claiming to be the true Demetrius, advanced pretensions to the throne; and the Poles, first by clandestine efforts, afterwards by open hostilities, endeavoured to possess themselves of a part, or the whole, of the territory of an expiring nation.

Such was at this time the distress of Russia, that the assistance of Sweden was the only resource of the czar for

[25] Levesque was of opinion, that the young prince had not been killed, and that he really reigned during a short time.—Levesque, tome iii. pp. 111, &c.

resisting the aggressions of Poland. This assistance proved ineffectual; the czar was compelled to abdicate his crown, and the king of Poland was invited to send his son to be the sovereign of Russia. Fortunately for the independence of the nation, the violences practised by the Poles, and the plans of conquest or dismemberment entertained by their monarch, alienated the Russians from this dangerous connexion. When they had afterwards with a similar proposal courted the assistance of the rival power of Sweden, the same selfish ambition, which had appeared in the measures of Poland, again fortunately betrayed itself, and determined them to seek among themselves the founder of a new dynasty. They then concurred in electing Michael, whose prudent government, in a long reign of thirty-two years, healed the wounds of the nation, and whose descendants have rendered Russia an object of principal importance in the general system.

For discovering the bearing of this short, but considerable, interruption of the progressive improvement of Russia, we must look to the relation, which that country bore to the neighbouring country of Poland, and to the situation, in which the latter was at this time placed in respect of the southern combinations of Europe. It is only in this manner, that Russia, in that early period, can be regarded as at all connected with the general arrangements of Europe, being too remote for direct interference at this stage of improvement, as it was also too little advanced for a participation of distant interests. Various causes had however established such a facility of action and re-action between that country and Poland, that a close and intimate relation must have subsisted between them. Sprung from the same Slavian population, and therefore corresponding in many of their habits; long accustomed to the same language, for the general use of the Latin language[26] had not been introduced

[26] The general knowledge of the Latin language in Poland has been referred to the time of Casimir IV., who began his reign in the year 1447. This prince is said to have been so ashamed of his own inability, and of that of his courtiers, to reply to a king of Sweden, who had addressed him in Latin, being ignorant of the Polish language, that he required by proclamation, that it should be studied by all, who aspired to advancement. Loccenius however, on whose authority this has been stated, omitted the anecdote in a later edition of his history.

among the Poles long before the commencement of the sixteenth century; and separated by no natural boundary, which might have taught each nation to regard the other as aliens, they were incapable of being so insulated, even by the antipathy of their differing churches, that a conducting influence should not convey to either nation some result of every change experienced by the other.

In the year 1507 Sigismond I., the illustrious contemporary of the emperor Charles V., began in Poland a reign of forty-one years, distinguished as the period, in which this country attained to its highest improvement. The reign of this prince was an uninterrupted series of successful exertions for the security and improvement of his people. At his death he left his kingdom to his son Sigismond, who in his lifetime had been elected to succeed him. The same course of wise and vigorous government was then continued during twenty-four years, the time of the reign of the second Sigismond, so that Poland appears to have enjoyed an extraordinary degree of prosperity during sixty-five years of the sixteenth century. The death of the latter prince, who left no issue, terminated in the year 1572, the series of Lithuanian sovereigns, who were elected indeed, but were all chosen from the same family; and the throne of Poland was from that time abandoned to the general ambition, not only of the Poles, but also of foreign nations.

Of the princes thus simply elected three only were included within the period of time at present considered; and it is observable that these three were not only strangers, but of three different countries, the first of them having been a prince of France, the second of Transylvania, and the third of Sweden.

—Hartknoch, pp. 82, 83. Some refer it to the time of Stephen Battori, who began his reign in the year 1576, this prince being himself under a necessity of addressing the Poles in that language, as he was not acquainted with the language of Poland. It is certain that it was much encouraged by him, especially as he established in his kingdom schools under the care of jesuits. But already in the time of Sigismond I., who ascended the throne in the year 1507, the German emperor remarked with surprise, that even the charioteers of a Polish ambassador were skilled in the language of Rome.—Hartknoch, pp. 93, 94. The peculiarity of the language of the country, together with the example and influence of a Romish priesthood, naturally introduced the use of the Latin language into Poland as into Hungary.

The French prince, after a reign of but five months, made a clandestine retreat to his own country, to the crown of which he succeeded under the name of Henry III., after the death of his brother. The influence of a reign so transitory appears to have consisted in establishing more firmly the practice of elections among a people still so partial to the family of their former sovereigns, that the Transylvanian prince was chosen in contemplation of an alliance with one of the two sisters of the second Sigismond, and the Swedish prince in consideration of being the son of the other. It had indeed been stipulated with the French prince, that he should marry the former of these princesses, though the condition had not been executed.

The throne having been declared vacant in consequence of the departure of Henry, the Transylvanian prince, Stephen Battori, was elected, and governed the kingdom with vigour and success during the ten following years. Among the promises[27], by which this prince conciliated the Poles, we find that he engaged to secure the provinces of the kingdom from insult; and among his measures we learn that he organised the Cossacks[28], a tribe of uncivilised refugees of Russia and Poland, forming them into a perpetual guard of his frontier against the predatory incursions of the Tatars. These circumstances may perhaps be regarded as sufficiently indicating the bearing of the election of a prince from the eastern extremity of Christian Europe, the vicinity of the most formidable enemies of Poland. The personal character of the prince seems to have been well adapted to the position, in which he was placed. Disciplined by the difficulties of his early years[29], and instructed by the studies, for which an imprisonment of three years had afforded him leisure, particularly by the repeated perusal of the Commentaries of Cæsar, he was at once attentive to the distresses of his subjects, and dreaded by their enemies.

The election of the Swedish prince, Sigismond III., was important to the political relation of Poland to the German empire. He was elected king of Poland in the year 1587, and died in the year 1632, after a long reign of forty-five years. Seven years after he had been elected to the throne

[27] Abrégé Chron. de l'Hist. de Pologne, p. 142. Vars. et Dresde, 1763. [28] Ibid, p. 146. [29] Ibid., p. 154.

of Poland, he succeeded to that of Sweden in consequence of the death of his father, and a union of the two crowns was thus effected. The result of the union was antipathy and separation. The bigoted attempts of the prince to change the religion of Sweden[30], and reduce it to a conformity with that of Poland, caused the Swedish crown to be transferred to his uncle, and the personal hostility of the two sovereigns exasperated the opposition already subsisting between the two nations. It is to be observed that the last fourteen years of the reign of Sigismond were coincident with the great struggle of Germany, which was terminated by the treaty of Westphalia, and that in this war Sigismond, the king of Roman Catholic Poland, was the ally of the emperor, as the king of Protestant Sweden was the protector of the confederate princes. The reign of the Swedish prince, though it formed a temporary union of the two governments, tended by its eventual operation to alienate them decisively one from the other, and thus disposed them to assume with more determined opposition their appropriate places in the general combination.

To this arrangement it appears to have been necessary that the power of Russia should be then paralysed by a temporary debility. The assistance afforded by the Poles to the emperor[31] involved them in a war with the Turks and Tatars, which, as it occurred at the same time with the war of Sweden, required the utmost efforts of the government. If Russia at this crisis had been able to indulge that spirit of hereditary hostility, by which it had been long animated against the neighbouring nation, Poland must have sunk under the attacks of its enemies, and the entire system of political relations must have been disturbed. Such a catastrophe was however averted by the domestic disturbances, which for some years disabled the rising empire of the north; and, as Poland had formerly improved and consolidated her government, while Russia was subject to the Tatars, so did she at this time exercise an influence on the general system of Europe, while the power of that country suffered a temporary suppression from internal distractions. It is remarkable that the Poles, by the support which they

[30] Coxe's Hist. of the House of Austria, vol. i. p. 829.
[31] Hist. of Poland, p. 142. Dubl. 1795.

gave to the several impostors of Russia, had fomented the dissensions, by which they were themselves afterwards protected, and thus unconsciously made preparation for the protection, which they afterwards experienced. The bearing of that period of debility in the history of Russia is thus explained from a consideration of the function, which Poland appears to have discharged in the war of Germany.

The assistance of Poland was important to the emperor in the very commencement of the war of Germany, Sigismond having then supplied that sovereign with an aid of four thousand Cossacks[32], by which he suppressed a revolt of the Bohemians. Its force was afterwards employed in a manner more directly bearing upon the result of that war, for it was the agent, by which Sweden was occupied, until the power of Denmark had been tried and exhausted. In the sixth Chapter of this Book it shall be shown, that this was a necessary part of the combinations of that great struggle.

It is important to consider how it happened, that Poland preserved that connexion with the Roman see, which, by alienating it from Sweden, threw it into the party of the emperor. The final discomfiture too of the reformation in Poland, considered in connexion with the unrestrained progress, which the excessive freedom of the country had permitted it to make, may afford us an instructive admonition in regard to the checks and limitations, which that ecclesiastical revolution encountered in the other countries of Europe.

The doctrines of Luther[33] were extensively propagated in Poland during the reign of the second Sigismond, who ascended the throne in the year 1548. This prince not only gave no opposition to the new doctrines, but also heard and protected the preachers of the Protestants; and Poland seemed to be almost ready to embrace publicly the faith of Luther, many even of the bishops and other clergy being favourably inclined. As the reformation was introduced into Poland in the very beginning of the reign of Sigismond II., and this prince retained possession of the throne during twenty-four years, it must have made before his death a very considerable progress. The change of the constitution,

[32] Hist. of Poland, p. 143. [33] Hartknoch, pp. 84, 85.

by which the crown after this prince became simply elective, gave a check to the progress of the reformed religion, by introducing sovereigns of the church of Rome. It did not indeed during fifteen years produce this effect. Henry of Anjou, the first of the simply elected princes, was attached to the ancient religion, and this attachment had probably facilitated his election, by procuring for him the support of the Roman Catholics; but his transitory reign of five months could have little, or rather no operation in checking the reformation, and we are informed[34], that it continued to extend itself, especially in the more distant provinces. The Transylvanian prince, Stephen Battori, who succeeded Henry, is sufficiently characterised by his own memorable observation[35], that the Deity had reserved three things to himself, the power of creating, the knowledge of futurity, and the government of the consciences of men. After him however, was elected Sigismond III., who, though a prince of Sweden, yet being the son of a Roman Catholic princess[36], had been educated in the religion of Rome, and was prepared to give at length to the Roman Catholics of Poland the protection and favour of the court. This prince was elected to the throne of Poland in the year 1587, and held possession of it until the year 1632, dying fourteen years after the commencement of the German war.

Such was the influence of the early prosperity of the reformation in Poland, that the diet[37], assembled upon occasion of the death of Sigismond II., determined to maintain a reciprocal indulgence of the differing tenets, and agreed with the most perfect impartiality that both parties should be denominated Dissidents, not as dissenting from any approved doctrine, but simply as disagreeing among themselves. Here seems to have been realised that happy system of mutual toleration, which is so agreeable to the dictates of the gospel, but was unfortunately so little accommodated to the circumstances of the sixteenth century. The

[34] Abrégé Chron., p. 138. [35] Hartknoch, p. 93. [36] Ibid., p. 96. That princess was the sister of Sigismond II., who had been so favourable to the reformed religion. As she adhered to the church of Rome, she was probably more determined in her support of it on account of the disposition of that prince to encourage the Protestants.

[37] Rulhiére, tome i. p. 40.

result may furnish a proof from the example of Poland, that, if the reformation had been elsewhere received with general acquiescence, it would probably have been speedily lost in its own excesses, and that Europe must either, like that country, have returned to the church, from which it had detached itself, or have abandoned, in the wild extravagance of unrestrained opinion, the essential doctrines, perhaps the very profession, of the religion of Christ.

The great freedom enjoyed in Poland[38] having encouraged considerable numbers of Unitarians to seek an asylum in that country, they formed numerous congregations in several towns, and constituted Racow the metropolis of their sect. The trinitarian Protestants[39] took alarm at the open profession of tenets, which they regarded as contradictory to the sacred writings, and concurred with the Roman Catholics to persecute the Unitarians: this persecution proved the prelude to another, which themselves afterwards suffered from the Roman Catholics, with whom they had co-operated in suppressing heresy by violence: the name of Dissidents then, losing its original application, by which it was alike attributed to all sects of Christians, began to designate as sectaries those alone, who separated from the authorised church of the country: and the reformation in Poland served only to introduce into the constitution, by religious dissension, a new principle of disorder, by which the final ruin of the nation was rendered more easy to the ambition of the surrounding governments.

CHAPTER V.

Of the histories of Denmark and Sweden, from the dissolution of the union of Calmar in the year 1524 *to the commencement of the German war of thirty years in the year* 1618.

War of Denmark with Lubeck, in the year 1534—Peace with Lubeck, and the reformation established in Denmark, 1536—War begun with Sweden, 1563—ended, 1570—War again begun with Sweden, 1611—

[38] Mosheim, vols. iv. pp. 499, &c. [39] Hist. of Poland, pp. 306, &c.

ended, 1612—The reformation established in Sweden, 1528—War with Lubeck, 1534—ended, 1536—War with Russia, 1555—War of Livonia, 1561—War with the hanseatic cities, 1562—War with Denmark, 1563—Sweden united with Poland, 1592—War with Russia ended, 1595—Union with Poland dissolved, and war begun, 1604—War with the Poles in Russia begun, 1609—War with Denmark begun, 1611—ended, 1612—War with the Poles in Russia ended, and Ingria acquired by Sweden, 1617—Copernicus—Tycho Brahé.

THE entire history of the Gothic, or German, nations of Denmark and Sweden, with Norway, may be distributed into three periods, the first of which preceded the dissolution of the union of Calmar, the second comprehended the time interposed between that event and the treaty of Westphalia, and the third was extended from this treaty to our own time. The first, which has been already considered, exhibits these nations influencing indeed the southern countries of Europe by occasional agency, but not maintaining with them any settled combinations of political interests, and Sweden as latterly separated from all such relations. In this period accordingly these nations cannot be regarded as involved in any system of political connexion, but appear rather as detached bodies, acting without regularity, as circumstances presented opportunities. The second period presents them as entering into an orderly arrangement, first as they were permanently distributed into two governments at the dissolution of the triple union, and then as these were successively engaged in the great war of Germany. In this period accordingly, we observe them, as soon as they had settled their respective constitutions, attaching themselves as satellites to the great system, which the southern governments were beginning to combine. The third period exhibits to us these two governments separating themselves from the southern system of Europe, and constituting with Russia a distinct system in the north, as we might suppose that the exterior and lesser bodies of a planetary system would revolve in new orbits round another centre, if a body of an overpowering attraction should be formed in their vicinity. The present chapter will comprehend only a part of the second of these periods, as it will review the adjustment of the two governments, without entering upon the consideration of their interposition in the war of Germany.

A variety of causes had prepared them for the several characters, in which they present themselves in these several periods. Situated in a corner of Europe, they were naturally prepared to form a minor combination of interests, which should but occasionally connect itself with the general system. Having received an influx of German population, similar to that which had spread over the southern nations of Europe, and consequently preserving a considerable affinity to them in manners, institutions, and languages, one of them also being actually contiguous to the German empire, they were specially qualified to receive from the larger system of European governments the beneficial influences of their manifold improvement in policy, manners, learning, and religion, and also to enter for a time into their political combinations. Commanding by their position the entrance and commerce of the Baltic, they naturally came also into such a connexion with Russia, when this state had begun to be considerable, as constituted them the minor members of a new and distinct system in the north of Europe, to which they conveyed the beneficial influences of their previous connexion with the more improved governments of the south.

In the history of the little northern combination of Denmark and Sweden we find these states supporting the contrary characters, which respectively belonged to their local situations, Denmark generally maintaining a maritime superiority, and Sweden being distinguished rather by military prowess. Sweden accordingly, though the more distant government, was that which could best exercise any important influence on the continental relations of Europe; and Denmark we shall in this period have occasion to consider chiefly as it affected the political habits and character of Sweden, constituting a sort of matrix, in which this other government was gradually prepared for manifesting its powers.

A strong repulsion was the natural result of a forcible conjunction of the two governments, when this had at length yielded to the forces tending to cause a separation. Denmark and Sweden were accordingly committed together from that time in a reciprocal opposition, which involved them in the relations of a little system of international policy, corresponding to that which, among the southern governments,

was constituted by France and England. Norway, continuing to be united with Denmark, composed with it the maritime member of the system, while Sweden, entirely excluded from the ocean, having in its actual territory little communication with the Baltic[1], and closely bordered by the provinces[2] of its recent ruler, and present rival, was the military member. It is observable that, as Sweden was in this respect circumstanced in regard to Denmark in the northern, as France was in regard to England circumstanced in the southern system, so did political interests give occasion to an intimate connexion of the two governments, and the Swedes gradually became so much assimilated in character to their southern allies, that they have been distinguished by the appellation of the French of the north.

The dissolution of such a union as that of Calmar, which, though with long and frequent interruptions, had however in some manner subsisted about a hundred and twenty-seven years, might naturally be supposed to have been followed by a war of so destructive obstinacy, as would have essentially injured both countries, and perhaps have even crushed in its first formation the system of the north. The singular combination of circumstances, by which a mischief so probable, and so considerable, was precluded, and sufficient time was allowed to the incipient system, for acquiring the necessary strength and stability, forms one of the most curious objects of attention in modern history. It so happened, that the union was dissolved without any immediate struggle, and that the apprehension of common enemies occurred at this most critical period, to enforce a continued observance of mutual forbearance, and even of amicable intercourse, which in any other circumstances must have been impracticable.

The common government of the union was peacably suspended by the flight of Christian II., the sovereign of the united monarchy, who had so outraged his subjects of Denmark, that in the year 1523 he deemed it necessary to abandon his throne, and to seek abroad for the resources, which

[1] Finland had however been acquired by Sweden about the year 1157.—Tableau des Révol. de l'Europe, tome i. p. 283. [2] The three southern provinces of the Scandinavian peninsula, Halland, Schonen, and Bleckingen, had been ceded to Denmark in the time of the father of Canute the Great. They were recovered by Sweden in the year 1658.—Tableau des Etats Danois par Catteau, introd.

might enable him to assert his authority. This event was followed in Denmark by the advancement of Frederic I., the uncle of the fugitive prince, who had already been engaged in a long contention with that prince about the duchy of Holstein, claimed by him in virtue of a grant from his father, who had been king of Denmark. The example of Denmark was in the next year imitated by Sweden, Gustavus Vasa, who had animated and directed the last efforts of his countrymen against the oppression of the Danes, being then elected to the throne. The union of the two countries was in this manner quietly dissolved; and, as Christian was equally an enemy to Frederic and to Gustavus, it most fortunately happened, that the two monarchs began their reigns under the apprehension of the hostilities of a common adversary, which necessarily impelled them to a speedy adjustment of their reciprocal pretensions[3].

Another combination of circumstances perfected, what the circumstances of the dissolution of the union had begun[4], and determined the two governments to enter into a close and intimate alliance. The city of Lubeck[5], the head not only of the great confederation of the hanseatic towns, but also of that more closely united association, which was composed of its northern members, proposed, as the grand object of its ambition, the sovereignty of the Baltic with the monopoly of its profitable trade. Enriched by its success in attaining this object, Lubeck had long enjoyed a maritime ascendency, which was formidable not only to the northern nations, but also to all the commercial nations of Europe. The prosperity of this little state had however begun to decline towards the close of the fifteenth century, as the Dutch had then begun to claim a share in the rich traffic of the Baltic, and Denmark and Sweden were endeavouring to emancipate themselves from the subjection, in which they were involved by the privileges unwarily conceded to the hanseatic cities. The vengeance of the once powerful city of Lubeck was therefore directed at once against these two kingdoms, which thus in her immediate vicinity rebelled against her commercial dominion; and her hostile efforts presented to them an additional motive for maintaining be-

[3] Mallet, tome vi. pp. 47, 61, 77. [4] Ibid., p. 186. [5] Ibid., pp. 165, &c.

tween themselves an amicable correspondence, that they might better resist the power of this other common enemy.

Favoured by the exemption from mutual hostility, which these circumstances bestowed on the newly separated kingdoms, the Lutheran reformation was within a few years established in both countries, a revolution constituting the affinity, by which they successively became connected with the Protestants in the great struggle of the German empire. Nor was it merely by allowing leisure for a change so considerable, that the harmony subsisting between the two sovereigns was favourable to it, for the example and exhortations of Gustavus, who introduced it in his kingdom about four years after his elevation[6], had a considerable influence in disposing the king of Denmark to resort, eight years afterwards, to the same expedient, for reducing the power of the ecclesiastics.

The early adoption of the reformation in Sweden was a result of the union of Calmar, that important crisis of the history of the north. In the long and violent struggle of the Swedish parties, occasioned by that union, the clergy had steadily adhered to the Danish interest[7]; and therefore Gustavus, when he had been declared king of Sweden, sought immediately in their exorbitant opulence the means of supporting his army[8]. It does not indeed appear, that either in this country, or even in Denmark, though the latter was contiguous to the Lutheran provinces of Germany, any disposition favourable to the reformation had prevailed generally among the people. Denmark has been described by its historian as a country of *obedience*[9], in which the Roman pontiff enjoyed as much authority as the kings themselves; and Norway was with difficulty induced to admit the change of religion, after it had been established in the more considerable of the two united countries. In Sweden the reformation, though doubtless assisted by the previous communication of the doctrine of the Lutherans, was principally the work of the sovereign, acting under the influence, and with the assistance, of the political circumstances, in which he was placed. The indignation conceived against the clergy of Sweden, on account

[6] Mallet, tome vi. p. 261. Puff., tome i. p. 348. [7] Vertot's Hist. of the Revol. in Sweden, *passim*. [8] Puff., tome i. p. 306.
[9] Mallet, tome vi. p. 343.

of the support, which they had given to the Danes in the struggles of the union, and the great ascendency, which Gustavus had attained over the minds of his subjects by his success in dissolving that odious connexion, enabled this prince to accomplish the religious revolution, before such a change was practicable in Denmark, where circumstances equally favourable did not so soon exist.

A combination of such circumstances was however formed in that country, ten years after the dissolution of the union, in the agitated interregnum, which followed the death of Frederic I. The clergy[10], alarmed at the progress which the reformation had already made under the protection of this monarch, laboured to exclude from the throne his eldest son Christian, who had been educated in Germany, and was known to be attached to the principles of Luther, and to procure the succession for his second son John, whose tender years and domestic education inspired them with better hopes of influencing his sentiments. In the contest which ensued, considering their success as certain[11], they usurped the entire administration, and were guilty of very grievous oppressions. The public calamity was aggravated by the people of Lubeck[12], the commercial rivals of the Danes, who availed themselves of the opportunity to attempt the conquest of the country, under the pretence of restoring to the throne the fugitive monarch, Christian II., whose flight had dissolved the union, their assistance having been rejected by the young prince of the same name. In this crisis of the public distress, the advancement of the eldest son of the late sovereign was generally regarded as the only measure capable of securing the safety of the state. The clergy were at length compelled to yield; and the advancement of Christian III., after such a resistance, was the signal of their fall. The new monarch had sufficient inducement to establish a reformation, which was dreaded and opposed by the clergy; the exhortation and example of the Swedish monarch encouraged him to attempt a revolution, already effected in the neighbouring country; and the general voice of the people was at this time

[10] Mallet, tome vi. pp. 147, 154. There was scarcely any city, in which the greater part of the inhabitants had not withdrawn themselves from the church of Rome.—Ibid., p. 137. [11] Ibid., p. 176.
[12] Ibid., pp. 187, &c.

raised against the clergy, who had in the late interregnum proved themselves the enemies of the public safety.

The establishment of the reformed religion in these countries, while it qualified them for entering into a plan of co-operation with the Protestants of Germany, exercised also a domestic influence on their internal arrangements; and it is remarkable, that a change common to the two countries, affected their political constitutions differently, exalting the aristocracy in Denmark, and in Sweden aggrandising the royal authority. Opposite influences, corresponding to these results, had already been exercised by the union of Calmar, and the reformation thus came in aid of the changes, which had been commenced by that combination.

From the union of Calmar the continually increasing importance of the senate, or permanent council, of Denmark has been dated by the historian of the country[13]. According to the ancient usage of the government the consent of the general estates of the kingdom[14], composed of the nobles, the clergy, the burgesses, and the peasants, had been deemed indispensable to the recognition of each successive sovereign; but, when the king was to be acknowledged sovereign of the three kingdoms united by the treaty of Calmar, it became necessary to delegate this office of the states general to a small number of deputies, all, or most of them, members of the senate[15]. From this time the senate began to assume to itself the right of electing the sovereign, and a powerful aristocracy began to be formed in the nation. The reformation, by destroying the temporal importance of the clergy, removed the only counterpoise of the nobility[16]. As the Lutheran bishops retained but a shadow of the authority of that ecclesiastical order, to which they had suc-

[13] Mallet, tome vi. p. 153. [14] Ibid., tome v. pp. 18, 19. [15] The states were assembled for the last time in the year 1536.—Tableau des Revol. de l'Europe, tome ii. p. 129. It does not appear in what manner the senators were elected, but it is probable that they were chosen by the king, as the senate was chiefly composed of the governors of the provinces. The senate of Norway appears to have been suppressed in the year 1536, the senate of Denmark having in that year declared Norway to be a province of their country, because the northern parts of Norway had, at the instigation of the bishop of Drontheim, refused to acknowledge Christian III.—Ibid., tome vi. pp. 334—337.

[16] Ibid.,pp. 319, 320.

ceeded[17], as the burgesses were few, and of little intelligence and credit, and the peasants had long lost all real consideration in the state, the nobles, from this time, acquired an uncontrolled dominion over the senate and the court, and every person not of their order was disqualified even for acquiring in any manner a property in land.

The period of the union having been to Sweden a period of hostile resistance, and Gustavus, the last leader of that resistance, having been at the dissolution of the union placed upon the throne, the aggrandisement of the royal power was in that country a result of the same connexion, which in Denmark had given a beginning to that of the aristocracy. The reformation, by enriching the sovereign with the spoils of the church, co-operated to magnify the importance of the crown. With a rapacity very different from the conduct afterwards observed by the Danish monarch[18], Gustavus annexed to the crown a very large proportion of the property of the clergy, and transmitted to his successors possessions so considerable, as enabled them to maintain wars with Denmark and with Russia. The crown, having already acquired from the circumstances of the country a military pre-eminence, was by the reformation supplied with the independence and influence of rich possessions. The Danish monarch on the other hand was too much controlled by the aristocracy, to be at liberty to appropriate to the crown the spoils of the clergy, and was probably on this account more easily induced to avail him-

[17] The Lutheran church of Germany was presbyterian, rather than episcopal, being governed by consistories, over each of which a superintendent, chosen by the consistory, presided. These consistories however, unlike the church of Geneva, were composed exclusively of ecclesiastics, and therefore the Lutheran church could in other circumstances easily accommodate itself to the episcopal government. The protestant church of Denmark was accordingly governed by twelve bishops, of which six were established in Denmark, four in Norway, and two in Iceland, the two dependent duchies of Sleswic and Holstein retaining the government of consistories and superintendents. The protestant church of Sweden was governed by an archbishop and thirteen bishops.—Pinkerton's Modern Geog. Tableau des Etats Danois, par Chatteau, tome iii. p. 31. [18] Hence, says Puffendorf, tome i. p. 332, are derived the great possessions of the Swedish crown, for the ancient patrimony of the kings was very inconsiderable.

self in a very moderate degree of an opportunity so inviting[19].

This difference of the operations of the same causes, the union and the reformation, on the internal arrangements of the two countries, corresponded well to the difference of the functions, which they subsequently discharged. Sweden, which became a very important agent in the war of Germany, and which, as if in preparation for this function, was almost continually engaged in war from the time of Gustavus Vasa[20], was through the influence of these causes reduced under an arbitrary monarchy, the government most capable of developing the military power of the nation. Denmark occupied a different position in the general system, and was accordingly affected by the same causes in a different manner. Almost the whole interval of time, interposed between the dissolution of the union and the commencement of the German war, an interval of ninety-four years, was to this country a period of peaceable improvement, not fitted to prepare it for the splendid and important career of the Swedish government, but most conducive to its interior welfare, and to the stability of its independence, which was more exposed than that of Sweden. The steady prudence of an aristocracy was most favourable to such a system of administration, and we accordingly find[21], in one instance, the senate and the nobles concurring to restrain the sovereign from engaging in a war with Sweden.

The aristocratic constitution of the Danish government had also another influence, important to the commercial interests of Europe. Sweden had not yet begun to assume the character of a maritime power, and to maintain the balance of the commerce of the Baltic. The provinces of Sweden adjacent to the Sound were still possessed by Denmark, nor had the people of that country any opportunity of engaging extensively in maritime commerce, until they had acquired a territory on the southern side of the Baltic. The hanseatic cities on the other hand had, since the commencement of the sixteenth century, declined from their prosperity and power, and Lubeck was every day becoming

[19] Mallet, tome vi. p. 321. [20] Ibid., tome vii. p. 275. [21] Ibid., p. 237.

less capable of maintaining a struggle with the Danes. In this interval between the decay of the hanseatic confederacy and the growth of the commerce of Sweden, if Denmark had been at liberty to obey the impulse of her local advantages, the valuable traffic of the northern Mediterranean must have become her monopoly, and the great object of the commercial policy of the Dutch[22], the freedom of the Baltic, must have been lost. The aristocratic constitution of Denmark however supplied the place of a rival power, by fettering the commercial enterprise of the nation[23]. The jealousy of feudal privileges was irreconcilable to the liberty necessary for the prosperity of commerce[24], and, on one remarkable occasion, the nobles opposed with the utmost vehemence the patriotic measures of an enlightened sovereign, lest the freedom of trade, which they enjoyed in right of their nobility, should be communicated to the inhabitants of towns. If this internal restraint had not controlled the traders of Denmark, the same spirit, which has since created the *armed neutrality* of the north, would then have monopolised the commerce of the Baltic, and by commanding its supplies of provisions and naval stores, would have enfeebled the commerce of the Netherlands.

The harmony, which the apprehension of common enemies so advantageously maintained between Denmark and Sweden, was at length disturbed, and a furious war of seven years afforded an opportunity for indulging that spirit of hostility, which seems to have been the inevitable result of their relative situation[25]. Thirty-nine years of concord however, had allowed a sufficient time to the two governments, for acquiring the necessary consistency and strength. Their mutual jealousies and pretensions were then again suspended through the long period of forty-one years, at the expiration of which another struggle, but only of a single year, served again to suspend them more effectually,

[22] Mallet, tome vii. p. 329. [23] Christian IV. was anxious to extend, equally as to improve, the commerce of his country. In the year 1618 he formed a company for the purpose of trading with Ceylon. He was disappointed in this project by the influence of Portugal, but from the rajah of Tanjour he acquired possession of the city and fort of Tranquebar, which the Danes retained. He also endeavoured to discover a north-west passage to India.—Ibid., pp. 339, 340. [24] Ibid., pp. 231, 338. [25] Ibid., tome vii. p. 114.

by leading to a more precise adjustment[26]. With the exception of the brief war of Lubeck, and of these two short interruptions, Denmark appears to have been steadily progressive in improvement during the whole period of ninety-four years, which elapsed between the dissolution of the union and the commencement of the war of Germany, its government having been during that time conducted by four sovereigns of distinguished ability.

The history of Sweden during the same period presents a very different picture. That country was indeed during thirty-one years of this period favoured with the same degree of tranquillity, which was so conducive to the prosperity of Denmark; but from the year 1555, in which a war was begun with Russia, the Swedes underwent a long discipline of almost uninterrupted hostility, by which they were trained for their extraordinary achievements in the invasion of the German empire. The war of Russia was six years afterwards succeeded by another, of which Livonia was the object[27]; and this again in the next year was followed by ano-

[26] The principal subjects of contention were the practice of bearing three crowns in the arms of Denmark, as maintaining the pretension of the dissolved union, and the encroachment of the Swedes upon Lapland, a dependency of Norway, and consequently annexed to the Danish monarchy. The former was on this occasion compromised by permitting the Swedish king to quarter the three crowns also in his arms; the latter was formally relinquished by Sweden. The latter was important, as the encroachment of the Swedes would have given them a communication with the northern ocean, and thus have enabled them to interfere with the fishery and commerce of Norway.—Ibid., pp. 273, 274, 323, 324.

[27] In the year 1207, a military order, named the Sword-bearers, was instituted for supporting the pastoral labours of the bishop of Riga, and a third part of Livonia was assigned to them on the condition of performing homage to the bishop.—Pfeffel, tome i. pp. 326, 327. This order in the year 1237 sought assistance from the Teutonic order, which had been founded in Asia, but was then established in Prussia; and an incorporation of the former with the latter having been effected, the bishop of Riga, renouncing his superiority over the Sword-bearers, was contented to become himself a vassal of the Teutonic order.—Ibid., pp. 350, 351. In the year 1514 Albert of Brandenburg, grand-master of the Teutonic order, afterwards the first duke of Prussia, discharged the grand prior of Livonia from all dependence on his order, and the latter was some time afterwards acknowledged as a prince of the empire.—Ibid., tome ii. p. 102. The interference of Sweden was occasioned by a cession of his independence made by the grand prior, or grand-master, to the king of Poland,

ther, waged with the hanseatic cities of the north. These hostilities served also to direct the efforts of Sweden towards the countries, in which she afterwards exercised an important influence on the political combinations of Europe.

It was the fortune of Sweden, sixty-eight years after the dissolution of her union with Denmark, to be involved in another, but much less durable connexion, with Poland. This connexion was occasioned by the marriage of John III., his queen being a sister of the last of the Polish sovereigns of the race of Jaghellon, and inheriting the pretension of her family. Sigismond, the son of John, who in right of this princess had been elected to the throne of Poland in the year 1587, succeeded five years afterwards to that of Sweden, and thus began a union of the two kingdoms, which however subsisted only twelve years, being dissolved in the year 1604.

The mutual repulsion resulting from this other union, though of so short a duration, had a more violent, and a wider influence, than that which arose from the conjunction of Sweden and Denmark. The latter, besides that it was moderated by external apprehensions, was not exasperated by a difference of religion, and appears to have been merely sufficient for supporting the distinctness of the two governments, whereas the former, while it was rendered more vehement by the efforts of Sigismond to change the religion of Sweden, became, by the connexion subsisting between Poland and Germany instrumental in engaging Sweden in the struggles of the empire.

John III., influenced by his queen[28], became attached to the religion of Rome, and employed himself in a series of efforts for subverting the establishment of the reformation in Sweden. These efforts were unsuccessful, but they were not destitute of an important influence on the relations and interests of his country. Like the disturbances excited by the misconduct of his predecessor Eric[29], for which that prince had been driven from the throne, the attempts of John[30] hindered the Swedes from interposing in the affairs of Livonia with so much vigour, as might have alarmed the

the city of Revel choosing rather to submit itself to the king of Sweden. —Puff., tome ii. p. 6. [28] Ibid., p. 78. [29] Ibid., p. 40.
[30] Ibid., pp. 78, 90, 101, 105.

Poles, and alienated them from the union soon afterward effected. They had also the further operation of strengthening the attachment of the Swedes to the reformation, and thus cherishing that principle of dissension, by which the connexion was abruptly and violently terminated. The death of the queen[31] put a stop to the endeavours of John to re-establish the religion of Rome; but his son Sigismond had been educated in that religion, and was so devoted to it that, when the senators of Sweden represented to him that, by persevering in his profession of it, he might hazard his succession, he replied that he preferred the kingdom of heaven to an earthly throne.

The government of Sigismond was at the end of twelve years renounced by the Swedes, who placed his uncle Charles on their throne. John, the father of Sigismond, had unintentionally made preparation for the dethronement of his own son by the favour, which in the latter part of his reign he manifested towards his brother, having, through apprehension of designs entertained against his life[32] by a disaffected party, done every thing in his power to conciliate this prince, consulting him on every occasion, and even constituting him the governor of his kingdom. The dangerous rival, whom John had thus raised up against his son, had long before attached the people of Sweden to himself[33], by opposing the efforts of the king for re-establishing the religion of Rome. He was accordingly, upon the death of John, admitted by the senate to the administration of the government during the absence of Sigismond, who resided in Poland. In this situation he secretly fomented the jealousies entertained by the Swedes against their sovereign, to which this prince gave sufficient occasion by his undisguised exertions in favour of the Roman church; and at length, after six years of dissembled hostility, and as many of open resistance, he succeeded in procuring the exclusion of Sigismond from the throne of Sweden, and his own advancement to the royal dignity.

From this time to the death of Sigismond, which occurred in the year 1632, or during twenty-eight years, Sweden and Poland were with little interruption engaged in a contest,

[31] Puff., tome ii. p. 107.
[32] Ibid., pp. 124, 125, 127.
[33] Ibid., pp. 86, 88, 89, 94.

arising from the pretension of the sovereign of the latter to the throne of the former, and exasperated by all the violence of a struggle on the part of the former to maintain the religion of its choice. Charles IX., by whom Sigismond was succeeded on the throne of Sweden, engaged immediately in an expedition to Livonia, then subject to Poland; and he afterwards supported the Russians against the Poles, who, with a policy subsequently turned fatally against themselves, were at that time chiefly occupied in fomenting the disturbances of that people. The hostilities of the two nations, recently loosed from an incongruous union, were thus waged in territories remote from Sweden, and served to discipline the military energies of her people, without injuring their domestic resources. The dissolution of the Polish union was not, like that of the Danish, succeeded by a long tranquillity; neither did Sweden then require such a period of repose for its restoration, not having been in this instance reduced to a degrading and ruinous subjection.

During seven years the struggle of the Poles and Swedes was maintained in Russia, the two nations having become engaged as auxiliaries in the commotions of that country, which followed the extinction of the reigning family. The ancient dynasty of Russia having failed in the year 1598, the Poles supported successively two claimants of the throne, each of whom assumed to be a prince of the royal family, said to have been murdered[34]. The leader of the party opposed to the Polish interest sought assistance from Charles IX. of Sweden in the year 1609. A war was in consequence waged in Russia, terminated in the year 1617 by the treaty of Stolbova, which ceded to Sweden the province of Ingria, with Hexholm and Carelia.

In the course of this war of Russia the crown of that country had been offered to a brother of Gustavus Adolphus, who had in the year 1611 succeeded to the crown of Sweden. An actual connexion of the two governments does not appear to have been an event, which could have had a beneficial operation in regard to either, or could have in any manner favoured the general arrangements of the policy of Europe. The inconvenience of such a connexion was how-

[34] Abrégé de l' Hist. des Traités de Paix par M. Koch, tome iii. pp. 32, &c. Basle, 1796, 1797.

ever precluded by various causes[35], particularly by the embarrassment occasioned by a Danish war of a single year[36], which disabled the Swedes for acting with the necessary vigour, and by the conduct of their sovereign, which gave occasion to suspect, that he proposed to extend his own dominions, rather than to procure a throne for his brother, or to assist his friends in Russia.

But, however inconvenient a union of the two countries might have been, Sweden afterwards exercised a powerful influence on the state of Russia, when Charles XII. invaded that country; and it deserves attention that the war, which was terminated in the year 1617 by the treaty of Stolbova, appears to have made preparation for that agency, by transferring to the Swedish government the territory, by which alone the Russians could communicate with the Baltic. The recovery of this territory was essential to the maritime designs of Peter the Great, and therefore the cession of it, made almost a century before, eventually involved the two countries in the hostilities waged against that prince by Charles XII. of Sweden. In the interval Sweden acted an important part in the German struggle, by which the relations of the southern governments were brought into an arrangement; but to act upon Russia appears to have been the appropriate function of that country, and the same prince, who made an impression upon Germany in the war, which arranged the southern combinations of Europe, had previously made an impression on that other empire, which his country afterwards especially influenced.

The earlier years of Gustavus Adolphus were not however so occupied with hostilities, that his attention should be diverted from the domestic improvement of his country. In an assembly of the states, convened in the year 1614, he regulated the forms of legal proceedings[37], the affairs of

[35] Puff., tome ii. p. 218. Other causes, mentioned by the historian, were the reluctance of the queen-mother to suffer the young prince to pass into a country so turbulent, the stipulation of the Russians that he should not bring with him many foreigners, and the jealousy entertained among the Swedes against James de la Gardie, the Swedish minister in Russia, as a stranger. [36] This was begun in the last year of the reign of Charles IX., and ended in the following by Gustavus Adolphus, that he might prosecute the war in Russia.

[37] Puff., tome ii. p. 225.

commerce, the military establishment, and many other matters important to the public prosperity, so that to this prince, though so much distinguished by his military conduct, the Swedes are indebted for the best regulations of their government.

Though the circumstances of these northern countries did not admit much of that early refinement, which has ennobled the history of more favoured regions, we discover amidst all their disadvantages two bright luminaries of science, Copernic, or Copernicus, a Prussian, and Tycho Brahe, a Dane, the former the restorer of the true system of the universe, the latter the father of the modern astronomy.

Copernicus, who died in the year 1543, three years before the birth of Tycho, had revived the system of the ancient sages[38], which assumes the sun to be the central body of the planetary movements; but for want of instruments and observations his theory attracted little attention, until, more than fifty years afterwards, Galileo, assisted by the telescope, perceived the gibbosity of Venus, which confirmed it in regard to that planet[39]. In the interval[40] Tycho, probably

[38] The first idea of his system he found in the writings of Plutarch, who taught him that some Pythagoreans, among others Philolaus, had conceived that the sun is in the centre of the universe, and that the earth revolved round the sun; and that others, denying the diurnal motion of the heavenly bodies, had taught that the earth also revolved round its own axis. He learned also from Martianus Capella, that some philosophers had thought, that Venus and Mercury performed revolutions round the sun. He was born at Thorn in Prussia, in the year 1473, and learned the elements of astronomy in Cracow, and afterwards in Italy. His system was published in the year 1543, under the title *De Revolutionibus Cœlestibus.*—Hist. des Mathem. par Montucla, tome i. pp. 656—628. Paris, an 7. Mr. Hallam has justly remarked, that one of the most remarkable passages in his work, is one containing these words: gravitatem esse affectionem non terræ totius, sed partium ejus propriam, qualem soli etiam et lunæ cæterisque astris convenire credibile est.—Introd. to the Literature of Europe, vol. i. p. 636. Lond. 1837. [39] The light of science could not however penetrate the thick darkness of the papal court, for not only was Galileo persecuted by the Inquisition, and twice compelled to retract his own inferences, but even in the year 1742 the two monks, who published the celebrated *Principia* of Newton, found it necessary to premise a declaration, in which they professed to assume the hypothesis of the motion of the earth only because they could not otherwise explain the system of the author, and to yield obedience to the decrees issued by the pontiffs against that motion. [40] He was born in the

desirous of being the author of a new system, combined that of Copernicus with the received system of Ptolemy, which had been published towards the middle of the second century. Maintaining accordingly with Copernicus, that the other planets perform revolutions round the sun, he taught that the sun, together with the moon, revolves round the earth, and that the apparent diurnal motions of the heavenly bodies are real[41]. Though the Danish astronomer corrupted the simple theory of Copernicus, he greatly improved by his observations the science of astronomy, of the practical part of which he must be considered as the author[42], while the credit of restoring its theory is due to his Prussian predecessor.

The events of the scientific life of Tycho were remarkably connected with appearances in the heavens[43]. Surprised at the accuracy, with which an eclipse of the sun had been computed, he resolved to study astronomy: having discovered a want of exactness in astronomical tables, relative to a conjunction of the planets Saturn and Jupiter, he conceived the project of perfecting the theory of the planets: astonished at the appearance of a new star in the constellation of Cassiopeia, he determined to construct a new catalogue of the stars, an enterprise not before repeated since the time of Hipparchus; and a comet led him to discover the erroneousness of the prevailing philosophy, which represented such bodies as meteors generated in our atmosphere, and the celestial spaces as filled with a solid and impenetrable substance.

year 1546 in Schonen, and died in the year 1601. In Jamieson's popular and heroic ballads translated &c., the astronomer is named Tyge Brahe. [41] Raimard Ursus, who claimed the honour of inventing the system of Tycho, improved it by the invention of the Semi-Tychonic system, which attributed a diurnal revolution to the earth, though this was claimed by Longomontanus.—Montucla, tome i. p. 662. [42] The principal service, which he performed to astronomy, was his improvement of the theory of refractions, though in this he committed two errors, first in supposing the solar refractions to be greater than those of the stars, secondly in terminating the former at the forty-fifth degree of altitude, the latter at the twentieth. The theory of the moon he improved by discovering the inequality named the *variation;* the alternate changes of the inclination of the orbit, by which it is increased and diminished; and that the nodes are alternately retrograde and progressive.—Ibid., pp. 664—666. [43] Ibid., pp. 653—663.

Frederic II. of Denmark, whose reign extended from the year 1559 to the year 1588, was the liberal patron of Tycho[44], and, that he might prosecute his observations, gave him the little island of Huen, in the Sound, and erected in it the observatory of Uraniburg[45]. Christian IV., his successor, has disgraced himself by a neglect, which compelled the great astronomer of his country to seek a retreat at Prague, under the protection of the emperor. As, however, the government, in the next reign, became an absolute monarchy, the banishment of a man of science could not be of much importance to that nation, and might usefully transfer his talents to another country, where they might be productive of greater advantage. The advantage in this case appears to have been, that Tycho was brought into conjunction with Kepler, who from his observations inferred, though he could not explain, the laws of the planetary motions, and thus prepared the way for Newton.

CHAPTER VI.

Of the history of Germany, from the abdication of Charles V. in the year 1556, *to the conclusion of the war of thirty years in the year* 1648.

The imperial dignity independent of the papacy, and the council of Trent dissolved, in the year 1563—The war of thirty years begun, 1618—The Danes begin to support the Protestants, 1625—make peace, 1629—The Swedes invade Germany, 1630—The Protestants of Germany make an alliance with France, 1634—The war ended, 1648—Kepler.

SUFFICIENT preparation has now been made, for entering on the consideration of the history of Germany, during the period intervening between the abdication of Charles V. and the peace of Westphalia, a period terminating in the first general arrangement of European interests. The German

[44] Mallet, tome vii. pp. 144, 206—211. [45] Uraniburg was destroyed by the violence of the winds, and by neglect. Scarcely a vestige was discoverable in the year 1652.—Montucla, tome i. p. 669.

empire, itself at this time rather a confederacy than a single state, was naturally the government in which a system of federative relations might best be formed; and the looseness of its feudal constitution easily admitting the separate connexions of its members with the surrounding states, this system might easily be so extended, as to comprehend independent nations in the combinations of a federative policy.

The influence of religious opinion was of paramount importance in forming the political system of Europe. The ecclesiastical division, generated by the reformation, arrayed the two opposing interests within the empire, and thus furnished the original principle of that equilibrium of contending powers, by which a balance was afterwards established in the general system. That revolution in the religion of Europe did indeed extend its influences through the concerns of all the governments of the west. It gave independence and power to the United Provinces of the Netherlands; it introduced the distant nations of Denmark and Sweden into the general policy of Europe; it even formed the connexion between France and the protestant states of Germany; it animated the struggle between Spain and England; and it furnished the predominant principle in all the internal agitations of our own triple government. Individuals everywhere felt that they had a private and personal cause to be maintained, and were impelled to seek among foreigners the co-operation necessary for their protection. The ardour of religious principle inspired their conduct with an energy, which considerations merely political would have been insufficient to supply, and furnished a common principal action to those, between whom no merely political relation could then have existed.

It has however been justly remarked[1] that, by a peculiar combination of events, the division of the church was connected with two circumstances, without which the result would have been wholly different. These were the extraordinary aggrandisement of the house of Austria, and its attachment to the support of the ancient religion. The former, it has been observed, aroused the princes, and the other armed the people. While the agency of the reformation was provided by the accumulation of abuses of the

[1] Hist. of the Thirty Years' War in Germany, by Schiller, vol. i. p. 4.

Roman see on the one part, and by the increase and diffusion of intellectual improvement on the other, the nations, on which it was to be employed, were also disposed to receive it to the best advantage by that long and complex combination of events, which terminated in the peculiar situation of the German empire and its reigning family. The first adjustment of the interests of Europe required the concurrence of the most various influences, and accordingly moral and political causes appear to have co-operated, in the most direct and palpable manner, to the important result.

The history of Germany from the abdication of the emperor Charles V. to the commencement of the celebrated war of thirty years, or through an interval of sixty-two years, was but the preparation for the final struggle of the revolution of religion, which had been effected in the reign of that emperor. Every thing relating to this grand crisis of Europe was of gigantic dimensions, in due proportion to the magnitude of the interests, which were to be arranged. Sixty-two years of preparation introduced a struggle, which has been characterised as a war of the extraordinary duration of thirty years; and twelve years before its conclusion began those efforts of negotiation, which were necessary for reducing into one common arrangement the numerous and disagreeing interests of the contending parties.

It was a curious combination of events, that France, during the long period of this preparation of the German struggles, should have been by its own religious dissensions disabled for interfering to create any disturbance. That government was afterwards an important agent in effecting the adjustment, but in the previous formation of the contending parties of Germany its interposition must have been premature and embarrassing. We accordingly observe its influence on the concerns of the empire suspended during three successive reigns, its own internal agitations compelling it to suffer those of the neighbouring country to pursue their course in an unmolested progress.

Three years before Ferdinand was advanced to the throne of the empire, the *peace of religion* had formed a temporary accommodation between the papal and the protestant parties of Germany. It was however an accommodation, which contained the germs of future hostility. A claim had been

strenuously urged by each party, which, as it could not obtain the acquiescence of the other, was arbitrarily admitted by Ferdinand, and thus remained liable to be questioned, whenever a favourable opportunity should occur. The Roman Catholics required[2], that those prelates, who should afterwards embrace the tenets of the Protestants, should be deprived of their benefices, a regulation distinguished by the name of the *ecclesiastical reservation*. The Protestants on the other hand demanded, that a toleration should be secured to those subjects of the Roman Catholic ecclesiastics, who should have conformed to the confession of Augsburg. In both instances, after various efforts unsuccessfully employed to bring the two parties to agreement, it was found necessary to substitute a decree of the sovereign for an amicable accommodation. To these occasions of future dissension between the Protestants and the Roman Catholics was added one, which prepared a dissension among the Protestants themselves, a declaration[3] having been expressly inserted in the treaty, which confined to the followers of Luther the advantages then accorded.

With this imperfect adjustment was concluded the long and busy reign of Charles V. The abdication of that prince then disjoined his German from his Spanish dominions, his brother Ferdinand, long before advanced to the expectant dignity of king of the Romans, and employed in the administration of the imperial government, succeeding him on the throne of the empire, while his son Philip became his successor on that of Spain. A sympathy of interest was maintained between the two branches of the Austrian family, which accordingly continued to be regarded by other governments as one great and formidable power; but the close and intimate union of Germany and Spain was at an end, and, while the energies of the latter were exhausted in struggles, instrumental to the development of the maritime interests of Europe, and preparatory to a more perfect adjustment of its federative relations, the former proceeded separately in a course of action, which terminated in effecting an intermediate and preparatory arrangement of the system.

Four reigns intervened between the abdication of Charles V. and the commencement of the war of thirty years. The

[2] Schmidt, liv. ix. ch. xx. [3] Pfeffel, tome ii. p. 174.

two former of these, which occupied about eighteen years, were distinguished by the ability and the moderation of the sovereigns; the two latter, which filled the much larger space of forty-three years, were not less remarkable for the mismanagement and disorder of the government. Though however so direct a contrast is observable between the reigns of the earlier and of the later of these princes, all may perhaps appear to have contributed to prepare the commotions, by which the empire was afterwards agitated.

The advancement of Ferdinand to the throne of the empire was the epoch of the independence of the imperial dignity[4] in regard to the see of Rome. Before this time a personal coronation by the Roman pontiff had been esteemed necessary for conferring the imperial dignity, together with the power of securing to another person the reversion of the crown by nominating him the king of the Romans. The pretension of the papal court continued to be admitted, until the pontiff brought it into question, by contemptuously rejecting the respectful application of Ferdinand for the customary honour, offended at the concessions, which that prince had granted to the Protestants in the *peace of religion*. When however Ferdinand had indignantly commanded his ambassador to depart from Rome within three days, if the pontiff should persist in refusing him an audience, the latter judged it prudent to enter into an explanation of the supremacy, which he claimed; and the result of the discussion was that the power, arrogated by the see of Rome, was even by Roman Catholics considered as destitute of all real foundation, and that the personal coronation by the pope was declared to be not requisite to the assumption of the imperial character. Maximilian the eldest son of Ferdinand, soon afterwards constituted king of the Romans in opposition to the wishes of the pope, withheld from him the last acknowledgment of superiority, by substituting the word *obsequium* for *obedientia* in the public compliment, addressed to the head of the church on this occasion. The papal pretension had done its work, first in relaxing the constitution of the empire, and then in binding the emperor to the see of Rome in the crisis of the reformation; but, the two parties of the empire being at this time regularly formed, and subjected to the action of

[4] Coxe's Hist. of the House of Austria, vol. i. pp. 587, 589.

determined interests, the external agency of the see of Rome was no longer either necessary or convenient, and the peculiar connexion of the two governments was accordingly terminated, as the ligature in the formation of an animal is separated when its function had ceased.

Ferdinand, though regardless of the papal claim of a direct superiority, was yet by a Spanish education[5] attached to the church of Rome. In his anxiety however to procure the assistance of the Protestants against the Turks, he endeavoured to conciliate them, by observing with the most exact impartiality the provisions of the peace concluded at Passau, and even solicited the council of Trent[6] to gratify them by permitting the marriage of the clergy, and the administration of the communion under both kinds. Only the latter of the two concessions, the consideration of which had been by the council referred to the pontiff, could be obtained. That council, which had been assembled for remedying the separation of the Protestants, was dissolved in the year 1563, Ferdinand himself declaring[7] that no advantage could be expected from it, though its sessions should be continued during a century. This prince died in the year following the dissolution of this celebrated assembly, when he had by the discreet exercise of the most valuable, though not the most splendid qualities, restored the exhausted energies of his country, and conciliated the esteem and love even of a divided people.

The historian De Thou[8] has concluded his eulogy of Ferdinand with remarking, that he was in no other respect more fortunate, than in having such a successor as his son Maximilian II. This prince with great ability pursued the conciliating conduct of his father, and was even disposed to show favour to the Protestants, having received his education[9], though in the court of Spain, from a Silesian, who was secretly attached to the doctrines of Luther. Nor was he deficient in firmness and vigour, for to these qualities alone can it be ascribed that, while France and the Netherlands were agitated by religious dissension, he maintained his empire in tranquillity, no part of his territories[10], except Hungary,

[5] Coxe, vol. i. pp. 590—592, 601. [6] Schmidt, tome viii. pp. 139, 232, 260. [7] Coxe, vol. i. p. 595. [8] Hist. Univ. tome iii. p. 490.
[9] Coxe, vol. i. p. 609. [10] Ibid., p. 636.

being in his reign visited by war. Grateful for the blessings experienced under his pacific government, Germany revived for him the appellation of the *delight of mankind*[11], which had been bestowed upon the Roman Titus.

Such a combination of estimable qualities, occurring in two successive princes, though through so short an interval as eighteen years, might be supposed to have conduced to the firm and lasting establishment of the public tranquillity, instead of being in any respect preparatory to a great and general convulsion. Circumstanced however as the two religious parties of Germany were at the commencement of the reign of Ferdinand, the indulgence exercised by that sovereign and his son towards the recent party of the Protestants, though emanating only from the general mildness and equity of their government, allowed these to acquire a strength and importance, which afterwards provoked the most violent opposition of their adversaries. Ferdinand, as has been already mentioned, far from maintaining the rigour of the Roman church, solicited the pontiff to indulge his subjects with the cup in the eucharist, and their priests with the permission of marriage, and actually obtained from him the former concession. Maximilian[12] persisted in the same endeavours to conciliate the two religious parties, by urging the expediency of abolishing the celibacy of the clergy, until he had been repeatedly menaced with the papal vengeance; and to the protestant nobility of Austria[13] he allowed the free exercise of their religion within their immediate patronage, though he refused it to the cities, as belonging to the demesnes of the sovereign.

When, under the favourable influence of two such reigns, the Protestants had become so considerable, as to alarm and exasperate the jealousy of their adversaries, a much longer period of misgovernment allowed the two parties to indulge their mutual animosity in various preparatory contentions, which plainly portended the approaching convulsion of the empire.

Rodolph II., the earlier of two inefficient princes, whose reigns occupied this latter interval, has been described as affording a model of government[14] vicious in every particu-

[11] Coxe, vol. i. p. 648. [12] Pfeffel, tome ii. p. 196.
[13] Ibid., p. 204; Schmidt, tome viii. pp. 329, &c. [14] Pfeffel, tome ii. pp. 210, 212.

lar. During thirty-six years was the government of this divided state abandoned to mistresses and favourites; and so effectually was the emperor secluded from general intercourse, that strangers, who wished to see him, found it necessary to disguise themselves as grooms, and address him when he was visiting his stables. Whatever efficiency was possessed by this ill-qualified sovereign, was directed to the suppression of that party[15], which his predecessors had protected, his education, with that of his brother, who succeeded him, having been committed to his mother, the sister of Philip II. of Spain, and of a disposition altogether congenial to that of that prince. The protestant worship was accordingly suppressed in Austria; attempts were made to deprive the Protestants in Hungary and Bohemia of the immunities, which they enjoyed; and all occasions were employed for distressing and reducing their party in the empire, as in those other dominions of the emperor.

But, while the politician must in every respect condemn the conduct of Rodolph, the philosopher will recollect with gratitude[16], that he was the protector and patron of Tycho Brahé, who had been driven from Denmark by the neglect of his sovereign, and that his patronage has been rendered memorable by the construction of the Rodolphine Tables, in calculating which Tycho was assisted by Kepler[17] a Ger-

[15] Coxe, vol. i. pp. 648, 672, &c. [16] Ibid., pp. 727, 728.

[17] Kepler was born in the year 1571 at Wiel, an imperial city near the duchy of Wirtemberg. Having gone to Prague to meet Tycho, who was labouring at his theory of Mars on account of an approaching opposition of that planet, he suspected the error of the Danish astronomer, and proceeded to examine the movements of the planet, that he might construct a theory more agreeable to the appearances. For this purpose the planet Mars was especially convenient, being except Mercury the most eccentric. The description, which Kepler has left, of the difficulties encountered in this investigation, seems to indicate that he might have been a poet, if he had not been an astronomer, exhibiting an interesting picture of the efforts and the feelings of an ingenious and enquiring mind. His great discoveries were—1. that each planet revolves in an elliptic orbit, one focus of which is occupied by the sun, or a primary planet; 2. that the areas described round the focus occupied by the sun, or a primary planet, are proportional to the times; 3. that, in the movements of different planets round the same body, the squares of the periodic times are proportional to the cubes of the mean distances. The Rodolphine Tables of the planetary motions, in constructing which he assisted Tycho, were published in the year 1627.—Montucla, tome ii. pp. 269—283.

man, who, in his computations of the planetary motions, arrived at the very threshold of the Newtonian theory of gravitation[18]. Learning indeed flourished under his auspices in all its departments. He formed collections of curious specimens of the fine arts, of the remains of antiquity, and of the objects of natural history; he provided gardens for the study of botany; he cultivated chemistry and mineralogy with considerable success; and he encouraged literature so strenuously in Bohemia, that the Greek and Latin writers were generally known there, and his reign was the classical age of the language of that country. Unhappily even his love of learning had a mischievous influence on the character of Rodolph, for from Tycho[19] he learned to indulge in the reveries of astrology and alchemy, and apprehending from the prognostications of the learned Dane, that his life was exposed to danger from one of his own family, he secluded himself from society, and became utterly negligent of the concerns of his government.

Tycho, though, placed on the confines of two periods[20] he partook of the darkness of the one and of the light of the other, had however made very useful observations, and Kepler had in his calculations made so good use of them, that Leibnitz[21] ascribed it to the divine providence, that the observations of the Danish should have fallen into the hands of the German astronomer. Kepler gave also a powerful

[18] Kepler, says Montucla, was already persuaded, that the sun is not a centre without action, but the moderator of the movement of the planets; he suspected too that the irregularities of the moon are the effects of the combined action of the sun and the earth: he conjectured that the *aphelia* of the planets are sometimes direct, and sometimes retrograde, but that, being in each revolution a longer time direct than retrograde, they appear after a certain number of revolutions to have advanced: the universal attraction of matter, it is added, is clearly expressed in his commentaries on Mars: and he conjectured that the sun revolves around an axis. Still however he had no distinct conception of the physical agency, by which the motions of the universe are produced, for he imagined that the stars are animated beings, and that the sun possesses a soul of superior potency, which causes it to revolve round its own axis, and sends forth irradiations of some immaterial nature, laying hold on the planets, and drawing them into orbits round itself.—Bruckeri Hist. Crit., tome v. p. 634. [19] Coxe, vol. i. p. 689.

[20] M. Bailly, quoted by Mallet, tome vii. p. 211. [21] Bruckeri Hist. Crit., tome v. p. 633.

impulse to the geometry of his age; but those mathematicians only can here be noticed, who have enlarged the powers of the human mind by the invention of new modes of reasoning. But the varying narrative of intellectual improvement is a landscape darkened by a troubled sky, in which different tracts are successively illuminated and obscured, until the clouds of ignorance and error are at length dissipated by the rays of truth, and the wide horizon is made glorious by its unobstructed splendour. The learning, which Rodolph had so successfully encouraged in the university of Prague, was suppressed there fifteen years after his death[22], together with the protestant religion; and so successful in extinguishing the knowledge, and in enslaving the minds of the Bohemians, were the Jesuits, to whose care the university was then committed, that the very history of the country was from that time discontinued, and a Bohemian book can now rarely be discovered, to indicate that the people had ever been enlightened.

This feeble sovereign was at length deprived of his hereditary dominions by his brother Matthias, who in the next year succeeded him in the imperial dignity. The vigour and enterprise, with which the new emperor had advanced his fortune, gave promise of a reign very different from that of his immediate predecessor; but the difficulties of his situation were productive of not less disorder, than the weakness of Rodolph. His efforts to supplant the preceding sovereign in Bohemia[23], had encouraged the discontented and turbulent of that country; and he soon discovered, that he had sacrificed the independence of his authority to the gratification of anticipating by a short time his enjoyment of power. Instead therefore of recovering the government from the disorders, in which it had been involved by the incapacity of his predecessors, he was forced to permit them to take their course, aggravated as they had been by the artifices of his own ambition, and this too in the very district, in which at the conclusion of his own short reign they first assumed a character of violence.

The religious dissension of the empire was not confined to the struggle of the Protestants and the Roman Catholics, for

[22] Coxe, vol. i. p. 816. [23] Schiller, vol. i. pp. 55, 69.

an important division had arisen among the former in consequence of the twofold origin of the reformation. This disagreement of the Protestants[24] first showed itself in the year 1560, when in a general assembly of that profession an attempt was made, especially by the elector palatine, to explain and modify the confession of Augsburg, so as to accommodate it to the doctrine of Calvin. The same elector[25] afterwards proceeded to abolish Lutheranism in his own state, and persecute its adherents; and he published, in opposition to the confession of Augsburg, the catechism of Heidelberg, as the creed of the Calvinists of Germany. At length[26], in the year 1580, the progress of Calvinism and its intolerant spirit drove the Lutherans to a measure of resistance, in the publication of a form of belief, which they most inaptly denominated the *book of concord.*

A general view[27] has been already given of the influence of this grand division of the reformation, when it was represented, that the twofold character of the doctrine of the Protestants appears to have been necessary to the formation of a moderate and intermediate system of opinions, and that it at the same time furnished principles of political agency, accommodated to various exigencies of the system of Europe. Its influence, as it acted upon the empire, demands a special consideration.

The Protestants[28] were at this time far superior in number to the Roman Catholics, and must have overpowered their adversaries, if their strength had not been diminished by the reciprocal antipathy of their two churches. The issue proved the wisdom of cardinal Commendon, who in the very commencement of the schism had predicted, that theological contention and hatred would deliver the church of Rome from danger. It must at the first view appear to a Protestant unfortunate, that so fair an opportunity of bringing over to the cause of his church the principal government of Europe, should then have been lost by this dissension; but, besides that it may well be questioned, whether Europe was yet, in a religious view, prepared for a revolution so decisive in its ecclesiastical arrangements, considerations are suggested by

[24] Coxe, vol. i. pp. 593, 594. [25] Ibid., pp. 612, 613.
[26] Ibid., p. 660. [27] Chapter i. of this book. [28] Coxe, vol. i. p. 661. Pfeffel, tome ii. p. 283.

the circumstances of the empire, which may dispose us to regard as in a political view beneficial, the division which interrupted and restrained its progress.

If we consider the great war of thirty years as the process, by which, through the instrumentality of the mutual opposition of the Protestants and Roman Catholics of Germany, a system of equilibrium was to be formed among the governments of Europe, we must regard that dissension of the Protestants, which rendered such an equilibrium consistent with a vast numerical superiority of their party, as a very favourable circumstance. If their great disproportion of number had been brought to act with unanimity against the Roman Catholics, the balance of the empire must have been destroyed, and with it must have been lost that adjustment of the general system, to which it was instrumental. Weakened as the Protestants were by the disunion of the two sects, they were, though greatly more numerous, unequal in force to the inferior number of the Roman Catholics, and it was found impossible to maintain the interior balance of the empire, without calling in that foreign aid, by which a system of general equilibrium was begun.

A different, but not less important influence, of this disunion of the Protestants of Germany remains to be considered. The empire has been described as the central organ of the European system, from which the combinations of a federative policy were to be extended to the other states. As these combinations originated in the struggle of the Protestants, it appears to have been convenient that the empire should comprise among its various members some, which might be respectively connected by religious affinities with their two great parties. We accordingly observe, that the Lutheran doctrine formed a connexion of religion between the empire and the northern governments of Denmark and Sweden, and that the doctrine of Calvin constituted another with the Dutch republic. These affinities appear to belong severally to the two distinct periods of the federative policy of Europe, the connexion with the northern governments relating chiefly to the earlier adjustment, effected by the treaty of Westphalia, and that formed with the Dutch republic, relating more especially to the succeeding struggles,

in which the republic was the principal agent of the negotiations opposed to the ascendency of France.

The history of the war of thirty years, in which so many causes and circumstances had their development, is reducible into four periods; the palatine, the Danish, the Swedish, and the French. Of these the palatine period comprehended the internal struggle, with which it commenced; the others exhibit the successive introduction of three foreign governments into the domestic combinations of the empire.

The troubles, which first agitated the empire, and then almost the whole of Europe, began in Bohemia, where, almost two centuries before, a war of religion had been maintained for the doctrine of Huss. Intolerance again provoked resistance in that country, and the contention soon involved whatever of the spirit of religious hostility existed in Germany. The emperor Matthias, apprehending that after his death, as he had no legitimate child, his dominions, even the hereditary kingdoms of Bohemia and Hungary, might be transferred to another family, procured Ferdinand, a grandson of the emperor of that name, to be crowned king of the former of these two countries in the year 1617, and in the following year of the latter. This prince, who had received from the Jesuits a monastic education, soon displayed the bigotry of his character[29], in his efforts to suppress the privileges, which had been conceded to the Protestants of Bohemia by the emperor Rodolph II. In these circumstances a general alarm prevailed among the Bohemian Protestants, which disposed them to rise in arms on the slightest pretence; and the great war of Germany and of Europe accordingly arose from a difference in the interpretation of an ambiguous clause in the royal edict of toleration[30]. The Bohemians, encouraged by

[29] Coxe, vol. i. p. 744.

[30] This clause is as follows: 'If any of the united states of the kingdom, who take the communion under both kinds, should want to erect more churches, places of worship, or schools, whether in towns, villages, or elsewhere, this may be done without let or hinderance by the nobles and knights, as also by the inhabitants of Prague and Kuttenburg, *and all other towns*.' From the context it is evident that this permission was confined to the *calixtine*, or protestant members of the states, and that therefore the general phrase, *all other towns*, ought to be referred only to those towns, which were members of the states. It was however differently interpreted by the towns and vassals of the Roman Catholics.—Ibid., p. 747.

the speedy junction of the Silesians and Lusatians, soon found a leader in the elector palatine, who, inflamed by ambition on account of his recent marriage with a daughter of James I. of England, flattered himself with the hope of rising to the royal dignity, by possessing himself of the throne of their country. Matthias, while he was exerting his last feeble effort to stifle this war in its birth, either by arms or by negotiation, sunk in his turn, like his predecessor, under the difficulties of his situation, and left Germany to the bigotry and violence of Ferdinand II.

The new emperor was a prince in every respect qualified to bring into action the energies, which were exercised in the long war of Germany. Endowed by nature with all the virtues of a great sovereign[31], with prudence, firmness, generosity, and magnanimity, he had been taught by a monastic education to regard the destruction of the protestant religion as the grand object of his government. When therefore his intolerance had provoked the resistance of his subjects, the high qualities of his native character enabled him to sustain the contest with ability and perseverance, and drawing successively into the conflict the efforts of other nations, rendered the war of Germany the war of Europe, and the means of a general adjustment of European interests.

The elector palatine was unable to obtain any foreign assistance in his struggle with the emperor. James I. of England, who was then negotiating a marriage between his son and a princess of Spain, was unwilling to offend the court of that country; nor was he, in his high estimation of the kingly dignity, disposed to assist a revolted subject, though his own son-in-law. Denmark and Sweden, occupied with their own contentions, had not at this time leisure for a German enterprise. The United Provinces were sufficiently engaged in confirming and securing their newly acquired independence, amidst the commotions of political and religious parties. From the death of Henry IV. of France, that country, lastly, had lost its importance, and its government had become subservient to the interests and views of Spain[32]. The elector, thus abandoned to his own

[31] Coxe, vol. i. p. 753. Pfeffel, tome ii. pp. 320, 321.

[32] 'Mary de' Medici, the queen-mother, to whom the regency was

resources, was at the end of about two years overpowered by the emperor.

The first period of the war was in this manner speedily concluded, and, after a contest so short, peace might have been established, if the emperor had been disposed to act with moderation. The vengeful and intolerant character of this prince however prevailed to excite new and more violent hostility, and the palatine contest served but to expose that character to general observation, and to provoke an extended resistance. The emperor, not content with the humiliation of his enemy, transferred the electoral dignity to the duke of Bavaria[33], and purposed to gratify his own adherents with a division of the Palatinate. These measures excited alarm among the Protestants, who saw that, by the transfer of the electoral dignity from a protestant to a Roman Catholic prince, their interest in the electoral college was reduced to two of the seven votes[34]; and this alarm was increased by the persecutions of the Protestants, then commenced in the Austrian territories, and by the violence employed in introducing into the Palatinate the religion of Rome.

Urged by these considerations the German Protestants

intrusted, was governed by Eleonora Galigai, a mean Italian, and her husband Concini, who was raised to the title of marechal d'Ancre. These obscure foreigners, opposed by the great nobles of the kingdom, and embarrassed by the insurrections of the Huguenots, purchased the support of Spain by concluding a double marriage, between the young king and the infanta Anne, the prince of Asturias and the princess Elizabeth. Louis XIII., on attaining his majority, was anxious to free himself from the control of his mother and her upstart favourites. He at length found a deliverer in De Luines, one of the pages of his court, who procured the assassination of D'Ancre, and the execution of his wife, and for that service was rewarded with a dukedom and the supreme direction of affairs. The young favourite however was too weak to suppress the contending factions, or to curb the powerful nobles; he therefore followed the example of his predecessor, courted the assistance, and submitted himself to the guidance of Spain, and in compliance with the views of that power promoted the interests of Ferdinand in the empire.'—Coxe, vol. i. pp. 767, 768. [33] Ibid., p. 796. [34] The seven electors were the three archbishops of the Rhine, the elector palatine, the king of Bohemia, and the electors of Saxony and Brandenburg. The emperor being king of Bohemia, the number of effective votes was reduced to six, and the Protestants had before the transfer an equal interest in the electoral college.

looked round for foreign assistance[35]; and it happened that at this time foreign powers were willing to interpose. The policy of the English government had been changed, the project of a marriage, to be concluded between the prince of Wales and the Spanish infanta, having been abandoned, and a matrimonial treaty having been subsequently concluded with the court of France. The French court, under the vigorous administration of Richelieu, had resumed the political system of Henry IV., which was opposed to the aggrandisement of the house of Austria, though too much occupied in the suppression of the Huguenots for engaging at once in a foreign war. The United Provinces were willing to enter into subsidiary treaties against the house of Austria. The two northern sovereigns of Denmark and Sweden above all were interested both by religion and policy in opposing the extension of the imperial authority through the north of Germany, and were also stimulated against Ferdinand by personal considerations[36].

The king of Denmark, assisted with troops or money by all the other powers, except Sweden, took the field as the chief of the confederacy opposed to the emperor. In his competition for this honourable station with Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, he was supported by the credit of his brother-in-law the king of England; by the connexion which he had with the circle of Lower Saxony, as Count of Oldenburg and duke of Holstein[37]; by the superior reputa-

[35] Coxe, vol. i. pp. 798, &c. [36] Gustavus Adolphus was offended by the assistance, which that prince had afforded to his rival, Sigismond king of Poland, who had been driven from the throne of Sweden by his father, and had since incessantly disturbed his government by private cabals, or open attacks. Christian IV. was influenced by various motives equally urgent: by his relationship to the elector palatine; his apprehensions that Ferdinand would resume the sees of Bremen and Verden, which he designed for the younger branches of his own family; and the permission granted by the imperial court to the counts of Schaumburg, to assume the title and arms of the duchy of Sleswic, which their ancestors had possessed, and which was still contested with the house of Oldenburg.'—Coxe, vol. i. p. 799.

[37] Christian count of Oldenburg, connected by a female descent with the royal family of Denmark, was elected king in the year 1448, the preceding king having died without issue. Holstein was in the year 1459 adjudged by the states of that province to Christian, after the death of count Adolphus, who left no male posterity.—Tableau des

tion which a more mature age had permitted him to acquire; and by jealousy of Gustavus, who required, as he possessed no territory in Germany, the cession of some considerable fortress on the Baltic. Overcome by the superior influences of his rival, the king of Sweden withdrew from the contest, nor did he take any concern in the war, until the efforts of Denmark had failed. That crisis indeed soon occurred. The king of Denmark began his operations in the year 1625, and before the close of the year 1628 he was himself dispossessed of all his continental territories, except the single fortress of Gluckstadt[38]. His territories were restored by a treaty concluded in the year 1629; but this was purchased by renouncing the interests of his German allies.

The emperor had then again an opportunity of re-establishing the tranquillity of Germany, which he again sacrificed to the pride of success. The situation of the other powers of Europe appeared to favour the projects of his ambition[39]. Charles I. of England was embarrassed by his fatal contention with his parliament, and involved in hostilities both with France and Spain. The court of France, besides the contest with England, was still engaged in a civil war with the Huguenots, and was also disputing with Spain the succession of Mantua[40]. The Dutch were at once awed from without by the united forces of Austria and Spain, and agitated within by commotions political and religious. The Turks were at this time by intestine troubles rendered incapable of exercising their usual hostility against the house of Austria. Sigismond king of Poland was the faithful ally of the emperor; the king of Denmark had

Revol. de l'Europe, tome i. p. 404. Holstein was constituted a duchy in the year 1474.—Pfeffel, tome ii. p. 43. [38] Coxe, vol. i. pp. 807—812. [39] Ibid., pp. 814—817. [40] The duke of Mantua having died without issue in the year 1627, the succession devolved to the duke of Nevers, descended from a collateral branch of the family of Gonzaga, who had been acknowledged by the deceased duke as his heir, and had taken undisputed possession of the territories. But the succession was claimed by the duke of Guastalla, sprung from a more distant branch, and the Montferrat by the duke of Savoy, in consequence of his descent from a princess of that state. The king of Spain supported the duke of Guastalla, and concluded a treaty of partition with the duke of Savoy.—Ibid., p. 820.

been reduced to submission; and the distant sovereign of the petty state of Sweden did not excite any apprehension in the mind of a prince, so powerful and so successful as Ferdinand. Encouraged by a combination of so many apparently auspicious circumstances, he had conceived a plan of ambition, in which he proposed to crush the Protestants of Germany, to establish his own absolute authority, to acquire a naval force on the Baltic, to dethrone Gustavus, and to restore the crown of Sweden to Sigismond king of Poland, his brother-in-law and ally.

As the fall of the elector palatine had brought forward the king of Denmark, so that of the king of Denmark called forth the king of Sweden, and a new period of this great and various contest had its commencement. Cardinal Richelieu, eager to provide a new adversary for the house of Austria, negotiated a truce between Poland and Sweden[41], which left the latter at liberty for a war with the emperor. Gustavus, though his overtures of assistance were favourably received only by two princes[42], one of the dukes of Saxe-Lauenburg and the deposed administrator of Magdeburg, entered Germany with only fifteen thousand men in the year 1630, trusting to early success for procuring adherents and support. Fortunately for his enterprise, the emperor, as if under the influence of an infatuation, had sent a considerable number of his best troops on various foreign expeditions[43], and was afterwards induced by the artful negotiations of the French to dismiss eighteen thousand of his best cavalry. The successes of Gustavus soon disposed the French to negotiate with him on terms of equality[44], which had been before declined; and in the year 1631 a treaty of subsidy was concluded with him by that government.

The king of Sweden, in the year following that in which he had begun his enterprise, gained over the imperialists the important victory of Leipsic, chiefly because his new tactics[45], which were fitted for rapid and vigorous movements, gave him a decisive superiority. A series of successes rewarded the heroism and conduct of Gustavus, though limited to a very brief period, his career being terminated by death at the battle of Lutzen, little more than

[41] Coxe, vol. i. p. 831. [42] Ibid., p. 836. [43] Ibid., pp. 819, 826. [44] Ibid., p. 835. [45] Ibid., p. 852.

two years after he had entered Germany; even then the Swedish army remained masters of the field, when the commander had perished, who had led them to victory.

On this occasion might the emperor by conciliation have concluded an advantageous peace with the Protestants[46]; but, considering the death of Gustavus as fatal to the success of his adversaries, he resisted the advice of his own general, who urged the expediency of seeking an accommodation. Though however the crown of Sweden was by that event transferred to Christina, a female and a minor, the exertions of the government were continued with considerable vigour to the conclusion of the war. The hostilities, in which it had been long engaged, had disciplined the people; and the chancellor Oxenstiern, already distinguished by the wisdom of his policy, was found in military ability almost equal to fill the place of Gustavus.

If it be asked, what was the operation of an event so remarkable, as the death of that prince in the mid-career of victory, the answer has already been partly given by historians[47], who have remarked that the Swedish hero, transported by success, had forgotten the cause in which he was engaged, and had begun to take measures for establishing his own power in the heart of Germany. The ball, which deprived him of life, rescued Germany and Europe from the confusion, in which they must have been involved by the success of this enterprise of ambition. The interposition of Sweden was continued with sufficient vigour by the energies, which his heroism had excited and directed; but the object of that interposition was from this event an honourable peace, not a conquest to be effected in the empire.

To this remark it may be added, that the abatement of the vigour of the Swedish interposition, which was consequent to the death of the king, had an important operation, as it left room for the transformation of the French government from the character of a subsidizing ally into that of an active principal in the war, and thus completed the combinations of the great struggle of Germany. The Swedes with their German allies sustained so severe a defeat about two years after the death of Gustavus, that it was found necessary to form with France an offensive and defensive

[46] Coxe, vol. i. p. 887. [47] Ibid., p. 862; Schiller, vol. ii. pp. 98, 99.

alliance, in addition to the treaty of subsidy, which already connected that country with Sweden. The terms required by France were such[48], as delivered to that nation the keys of the empire, and consequently could not have been admitted by the Germans, except in a crisis of no ordinary difficulty.

The first effort of negotiation was made towards the close of the year 1636, and early in the following Ferdinand II. died, leaving his dominions to his son Ferdinand III., who had just before been elected king of the Romans. When the period of negotiation had thus been commenced, the unyielding bigotry and unbounded ambition of Ferdinand II. were no longer suited to the time, and a sovereign of a different character, yet still possessing distinguished endowments, was required for conducting the great struggle to an orderly termination. Ferdinand III. has accordingly been described as possessing the virtues of his father, without those faults, which had rendered that prince the scourge of Germany[49]. Equally prudent, and more warlike than his predecessor, the young prince sustained with ability the contest, which the bigotry and ambition of his father had provoked and exasperated: free from his intolerance, he allowed religious animosities to subside into a moderation, which admitted a mutual accommodation of conflicting interests; and more artful in his ambition, he concealed the plans, which he had formed for its gratification, and by his caution disarmed the resistance of those by whom he was opposed. With such qualities Ferdinand III. seems to have been specially gifted for quieting the contentions, and adjusting the interests of his country, as his father appears to have been peculiarly formed for exciting the former to the most violent activity. Nor did the influence of the personal character of this emperor terminate with the negotiations of Westphalia, for when the treaty there concluded had restored the peace of Germany, he regained the confidence of the

[48] Coxe, vol. i. p. 907. France was to retain, as a deposit, all Alsace, except Benfield, with the towns of Philipsburg and Spire, until the conclusion of a peace, reserving the authority of the empire; and the confederates were to assist in the conquest of Brisac, and the fortresses of the Upper Rhine as far as Constance, and in the recovery of Philipsburg. [49] Pfeffel, tome ii. pp. 355, 356.

states of the empire, and procured for his successors a decisive preponderance in the national assemblies, by adding to the college of princes eight new members, chiefly subjects or vassals of the family of Austria.

All the governments of Europe, except the distant and still unformed state of Russia, and that of Portugal, which was extricated from the Spanish union but eight years before its termination, had at length become parties in this memorable war. Spain and Poland had given their aid to the support of Austria and the church of Rome; the two powers of the Baltic, the Dutch republic, and England, had on the contrary in a greater or less degree strengthened the cause of the Protestants; France, though a Roman Catholic government, had through policy attached itself to the latter; and the Turks, with the bordering tribes of Transylvania and the insurgents of Hungary, assisted them to balance the power of the emperor. The belligerent states were at length sufficiently exhausted, to be disposed to adjust their interests by negotiation; and the events of the war had placed them in a relative situation, which was compatible with such an adjustment, as might form the basis of the public law of Europe. In the negotiations all the powers of Christian Europe[50], except England, Poland, and Russia, had their representatives. As Germany had been the field of the contending interests of Europe, so were the negotiations for restoring the tranquillity of the empire, the grand tribunal of the pretensions of the European states. Russia however could not yet be considered as entering into combination with the rest; Poland was on the other hand soon to begin to lose her importance, and after some time even to vanish from among the governments of Europe; and England appears to have been reserved for a subsequent arrangement of general policy, in which it became the rival of France, as the predominating power, whereas in this earlier one France was the antagonist of the predominance of Austria.

[50] Hist. du Traité de Westphalie, par Bougeant, tome ii. p. 50. Paris, 1767.

CHAPTER VII.

Of the treaty of Westphalia, and other arrangements connected with it, from the year 1648 *to the year* 1669.

Treaty of Westphalia in the year 1648—Treaty of the Pyrenees, 1659—Treaty of Lisbon, 1668—Treaty of the Hague, 1669.

A CONTROVERSY concerning the nature and importance of the treaty of Westphalia has, within a few years, been maintained by a French and a Prussian statesman, and on account of the connexion, which the former alleged to exist, between the operation of that treaty and the overbearing interposition of his country in the general concerns of Europe, has attracted a considerable portion of the public attention. Hauterive, the French writer, pronounced the treaty of Westphalia to have been a complete adjustment of the interests of Europe[1], as they then existed; and contended that the calamities of Europe arose from three important events subsequent to this treaty, by which its arrangements, sufficient in themselves to secure the rights of the European states for a succession of ages, were disturbed and confounded. These disturbing occurrences were stated to have been the civilisation of Russia, the aggrandisement of Prussia, and the great extension of the colonial and maritime system. Gentz, the Prussian writer, maintained on the other hand[2], that this celebrated treaty was very little more than an arrangement of the domestic interests of the empire, and that its nature and merit have been misconceived, as often as it has been considered as the foundation of the public law of Europe.

The truth will perhaps be found in this, as in most other controversies, to be placed in the middle between the adverse opinions of the disputants. An impartial enquirer will probably be convinced, that the French writer has exaggerated the importance of the treaty with the design of aggravating the disorder, which he has ascribed to the destruction of its arrangements; and that his antagonist has on the contrary

[1] State of the French Republic at the end of the year VIII.

[2] On the State of Europe before and after the French Revolution.

extenuated its influence, that he might deprive him of the advantage, which its importance would afford him, in justifying the violent usurpations of France, as necessary in the subsequent disorganisation and confusion. A systematic arrangement so complete, as Hauterive has described, could not have been within the contemplation of the parties concerned in this first general negotiation of the European powers, nor would it have been within their ability to effect it, if they had been speculative enough to conceive such a project. But neither is it reasonable to suppose, that the result of combinations, the formation of which so long involved almost all the powers of Europe in hostilities and negotiations, could have failed to establish among them some settled relations, and to dispose them to frame such provisions for the security of their several interests, as might at least be a foundation for a general system of international policy.

It seems that a juster notion of the character of the treaty, than that of either of these writers, may be formed by distinguishing between the negotiations and the treaty of Westphalia, for the history of the treaty shows, that a greater variety of interests was comprehended in the negotiations, than it was found practicable to adjust in concluding the treaty. Though Spain had ambassadors at the congress, the war between this government and that of France continued eleven years longer, being terminated only by the treaty of the Pyrenees, concluded in the year 1659. The jealous pride of Spain would not suffer the diplomatic agents of the revolted Portuguese to be acknowledged in this assembly of statesmen, though their interests were a subject of discussion. Twenty years elapsed, before a recognition of their independence could be extorted from the Spanish court, and the family of Braganza acknowledged on their throne in the treaty of Lisbon. Again, the war waged between the Portuguese and the Dutch states, which was a branch of the contest between Spain and the latter, did not admit an adjustment, until the events of war had decided the fate of the colonial possessions of the former, and it was accordingly continued during the struggle, in which Portugal vindicated her independence. This war was accordingly concluded by the treaty of the Hague in the succeeding

year. The three treaties of the Pyrenees, of Lisbon, and of the Hague, the first between the French and Spaniards, the second between the Spaniards and the Portuguese, and the third between the Portuguese and the Dutch, may thus be regarded as supplementary to the treaty of Westphalia, inasmuch as they adjusted those interests, which at the conclusion of this earliest treaty it had been found impossible to reconcile. The year 1669, in which the treaty of the Hague was concluded, may in this view be considered as completing the arrangements of the treaty of Westphalia.

In the negotiations of Westphalia the emperor[3], a part of the states of Germany, and Spain, were the principals on the one side; other German states, France, Sweden, and the Dutch republic, were the principals on the other; and a middle party was composed of the Roman see and the republic of Venice, acting as mediators, and of various states of Germany and Italy, the Danish government and the Swiss confederacy, the interests of which were involved in the discussions: the agents of the newly emancipated kingdom of Portugal[4], though not suffered to appear as ambassadors, lest the Spaniards should refuse to continue the congress, attended in the train of those of France, and endeavoured, though in vain, to procure the recognition of the independence of their country.

The powers thus brought together were curiously balanced. The two mediatorial governments, Rome and Venice, were by contrary influences disposed to favour the opposite interests of Austria and France. Venice had been, in the very first year of the German war, alarmed by the treacherous attempt of the viceroy of Naples, which has afforded the subject of the interesting tragedy of Otway[5], and was on that account particularly determined to seek among the French a support against the house of Austria, the Spanish branch of which had been predominant in Italy ever since the reign of the

[3] Bougeant, tome ii. pp. 1—50, 174. [4] In the year 1640.

[5] The particulars of this conspiracy are given by Giannone, lib. xxxv. cap. iv. Belvidera was the creation of the poet, not being found even in the romance of St. Real, published eleven years before the drama was exhibited. Jaffier is in the romance represented as shocked by a speech of the leader of the conspiracy, by which he designed to prepare the minds of his companions for deeds of violence, and in this manner prompted to betray the plot to the government.

emperor Charles V. The court of Rome was in the earlier part of the negotiations influenced by a similar policy[6]. Four years however before the conclusion of the peace a pontiff was elected, who devoted himself to the interest of Austria, as connected with that of the church of Rome, and finally protested by his nuncio against the injuries, which that church sustained from the conditions of the treaty. Of the principals, France and her allies were more powerful than their adversaries, and, from the commencement of the interposition of Sweden in the war, almost every year had been distinguished by some important losses suffered by the imperialists. A contrariety of interests however existed among the former, by which in the negotiations their pretensions were reduced to the standard of the other party. The attachment of the Swedes to the interest of the Protestants[7] was checked by the contrary tendency of the French government to favour the Roman Catholics; and their ambitious project of forming an independent establishment in Germany was controlled not only by the jealousy of their German allies, but also by that of the Dutch, who dreaded their commercial ascendency in the Baltic. The French on the other hand were regarded with suspicion and apprehension by the protestant confederates as a Roman Catholic and persecuting nation, by the Germans in particular as a people not naturally connected with them[8], and by the Dutch as encroaching and formidable neighbours[9].

Mably has observed[10], that the circumstance which rendered the peace of Westphalia the wisest of all treaties, was

[6] Bougeant, tome ii. p. 68. [7] The emperor and the king of Spain, to disjoin the interests of these confederates, began the negotiations in two separate and distant congresses, one for the Swedes at Hamburg, the other for the French at Cologne. The French government however, to prevent the mischief, sent ambassadors to the congress at Hamburg, and entered into an engagement with the Swedes, that the two negotiations should be conducted in concert. These were still managed in two distinct places, as well to save the honour of the pope, as to prevent disputes between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants; but Munster and Osnaburg, which are at a moderate distance, were selected for the purpose.—Coxe, vol. i. p. 949. [8] Bougeant, tome ii. pp. 226, 233, 263, 325, 463. [9] Ibid., tome iii. pp. 4, 5, 9, 61, 137, 329, 330. Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traites, tome i. pp. 73, 112.

[10] Tome v. p. 191.

that the negotiators traced every difference to its source, and were thereby enabled to give to each of them such a determination, that Europe would not again have been disturbed by war, if new dissensions had not arisen among its governments. Though this writer, like Hauterive, appears to have overrated the wisdom and efficacy of the treaty of Westphalia, the history of the negotiation is however the most curious monument of diplomatic skill, and the treaty became not only a fundamental law of the empire, but the acknowledged basis of all the international policy of Europe. Never had such a congress of statesmen been assembled; never had interests at once so important and so various been discussed.

As the house of Austria was composed of two distinct branches, two several attempts were made to detach the allies of France from the interest of this principal antagonist of its greatness[11]. The emperor laboured to induce the Swedes to accept a satisfaction for their pretensions, without connecting them with the claims of France; and the Spanish government was not less assiduous, in endeavouring to induce the United Provinces to conclude a separate treaty. The exertions of the French government were employed, on the contrary, in disposing its allies to resist all such overtures, and to agree only to a treaty, which should comprehend in one common adjustment all the contending interests. As Sweden depended on France for support in the military struggle, which was still continued during the negotiations, and influenced their progress, the latter was able to prevail with the former to adhere steadily to the plan of a common arrangement. The United Provinces, on the contrary, having no direct concern in the affairs of the empire, and regarding the aggrandisement of France with a jealous apprehension, were, a few months before the conclusion of the peace of Westphalia, induced by the Spaniards to abandon the common cause, accepting conditions advantageous to themselves[12]. These conditions were an acknowledgment of their independence; a cession of some important places, which they had conquered in Flanders; a relinquishment of the possessions conquered from the Portuguese, while these were united with the Spaniards; a stipulation that the Indian trade of

[11] Bougeant, tome iii. p. 373.

[12] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. pp. 112, &c.

Spain should never be extended beyond its actual limits; and another, which sacrificed the trade of Antwerp by shutting the navigation of the Scheldt.

It is observable that the different success of the French with the Swedes and the Dutch was perfectly consistent with the general interest of Europe. If the Swedes had been at liberty to conclude a separate treaty, the interest of the Protestants of Germany might have been protected, perhaps even an exact equality might have been established between the two religions[13], and the way opened for the advancement of a Protestant to the throne of the empire; but the Roman Catholic states of Germany would not have been combined with the Protestants in an arrangement[14], which, by opposing the collective power of the states to that of the emperor, at once reduced to an equilibrium the constitution of Germany, and the whole nation to its proper position in regard to the other nations of Europe. The constitution of the empire would have continued to be a struggle of two religious parties, not a balance of political authorities; and the emperor, supported by the party with which he agreed in religious principles, might have become absolute in the empire, and dangerous to the neighbouring nations. The separate treaty of the Dutch had no such relation to the arrangements of the empire, and was therefore free from any mischievous consequences. On the other hand, it made preparation for the more enlarged and perfect system of federative policy, which was to succeed to that begun at the treaty of Westphalia, partly by dissolving the connexion of the Dutch provinces with the French government, partly by commencing the adjustment of the new commercial interests of Europe with shutting the navigation of the Scheldt, an arrangement perfected in the barrier-treaty, which was concluded in the year 1715. The United Provinces were in that other, but not distant period, to be the centre of the negotiations, by which the undue aggrandisement of France was to be resisted and repressed; and it was therefore fitting that, in the primary arrangement of European interests, some prospective adjustments should be

[13] Abrége de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. p. 109. [14] Bougeant, tome iii. p. 323. Le zèle qu'ils avoient pour la liberté et les droits Germaniques ne s'étendoit pas jusqu'aux Etats Catholiques.

made, accommodated to the function, which they were soon to discharge.

The provisions of the treaty of Westphalia may be divided into two classes, one comprehending those which related to the constitution of the German empire, the other those which belonged to the satisfaction to be given to France. Both of these classes of provisions however were connected with the adjustment of the balance of Europe; the former, as the conditions reduced the predominant power of the house of Austria[15], the latter, as its stipulations augmented the power, by which it was to be counterpoised.

Before this time the states of Germany, though occasionally assembled, had enjoyed but an inconsiderable share in the government of the empire[16]. Far from being consulted in respect to the grand interests of war and peace, they were often consulted but for form in matters of police and revenue, which were regarded as their only subjects of deliberation. At this time every measure, both of exterior and of interior administration, was subjected to their consideration[17], and could be adopted only with their approval; and the states were authorised to provide severally for their own security, not only by forming alliances among themselves, but also by connecting themselves with foreign powers. The latter regulation had indeed also an important relation to the general concerns of Europe, for it provided the opportunity of connecting the balance of the empire with the general equilibrium.

The cession of a part of Pomerania and some other districts to Sweden[18], though a satisfaction given to the claim of a foreign power, may be considered as belonging to the class of domestic arrangements, because these territories were granted as fiefs of the empire, and the sovereign of Sweden was accordingly declared a member of the imperial diets. France was willing to accept its satisfaction on a similar condition; but the manifest inconvenience of ad-

[15] Mably, tome v. p. 312. [16] Bougeant, tome ii. p. 372. [17] Ibid., tome iii. p. 592. [18] This comprehended all the Hither Pomerania with the isle of Rugen; in the Further Pomerania the city of Stetin, and Gartz, Damin and Golnau on the banks of the Oder, with the isle of Wollin; the city and port of Wismar in Mecklenburg; and the archbishopric of Bremen and the bishopric of Verden in Lunenburg.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. p. 158.

mitting so disproportioned a member among the princes of the empire[19], determined the imperialists to renounce altogether their connexion with the ceded territory[20], abandoning it in full sovereignty to that government. The former arrangement contributed to maintain the balance of the empire; by a similar connexion with France it must have been destroyed.

Among the internal arrangements, by which the power of the house of Austria was controlled, the regulations adopted in favour of the Protestants held a principal place, and prove the importance of the interposition of Sweden in the war of Germany. The treaty not only provided for the redress of the grievances, which they had alleged, but also extended to the Calvinists the same protection, which had before been enjoyed exclusively by the followers of Luther; and the compensations[21], with which it was necessary to satisfy the elector of Brandenburg, for the cession of the territories demanded by Sweden, were supplied by a secularisation of some of the great benefices of the Roman Catholics. If the interposition of France was necessary for converting the struggle of the two religions into a political combination, that of Sweden was not less necessary for securing those religious interests, which the Roman Catholic government of France was not qualified to protect.

It is particularly remarkable that the circumstance, which at the first view appears to have been the great defect of the negotiations of Westphalia, the failure of the negotiation between France and Spain, contributed very directly to the grand result of all these arrangements, the reduction of the inordinate power of the house of Austria. France, by continuing the war with Spain, when a peace had been concluded with the empire, gave a fatal blow to that union[22],

[19] Bougeant, tome iii. p. 450. [20] The empire ceded to France the sovereignty of the three bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun; the sovereignty of Pignerol, which had in the year 1632 been ceded to France by Savoy; the old Brisach with its territory, and the dependent villages of Hochstatt, Niderimbsing, Harten, and Acharrn; and all Alsace.—Abregé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. pp. 152—154.

[21] Namely, the bishoprics of Halbertstadt, Minden, and Camin, and the reversion of the archbishopric of Magdeburg. These, except Minden, had been already in the possession of the Protestants.—Bougeant, tome iii. pp. 232—234. [22] Ibid., p. 485.

which had been carefully cherished by the two branches of the Austrian family, and was even strengthened by a political connexion[23], the king of Spain being a member of the Germanic body by the possession of the circle of Burgundy. As the separate peace, concluded by the Dutch with the Spaniards, had detached their government from its inconvenient connexion with France, so did the failure of that other negotiation of France with Spain relax the close connexion of the house of Austria, which had then sufficiently excited the efforts of other powers, and was not reconcilable to any orderly arrangement of political interests. As this was a very important incident in the history of these negotiations, it is a curious consideration that it should have been caused wholly by the pride and obstinacy of an individual, the Spanish ambassador[24], who could not be induced to consent, that a treaty disadvantageous to his country should be signed with his name.

The differences to be adjusted between the French and the Spaniards, though they had been so near to an accommodation, were numerous and important. The principal subjects of discussion[25] were the recognition of the independence of Portugal, which had shaken off the yoke of Spain in the year 1640; the demand of a long truce for Catalonia, in which province France had supported an insurrection; and the cession of the province of Roussillon, of which that nation had already acquired possession in the course of the war. Such was the situation, to which the Spanish government had been reduced, that the second and third of these articles might have been arranged; and in regard to the first, which was peremptorily refused, the French would have been satisfied with reserving a liberty of assisting the Portuguese as auxiliaries. The war was however continued in consequence of the punctilio of the ambassador; and a languid negotiation of eleven years more, carried on at the same time, was concluded in the year 1659 by the peace of the Pyrenees, which ceded to France[26]

[23] Mably, tome v. p. 258. Pfeffel, tome ii. p. 176. [24] Bougeant, tome iii. p. 485. [25] Ibid., p. 55. [26] France retained all Artois except St. Omer and Aire; in the county of Flanders, Gravelines, Bourbourg, St. Venant, and their dependencies; in the duchy of Luxemburg, Thionville, Montmedy, Damvillers, Ivoy, Chavancy,

various territories in the Netherlands, and constituted the Pyrenees the boundary of the two kingdoms, but contained no compromise of any right of dominion within the peninsula, nor any stipulation favourable to the independence of Portugal.

By the treaty of the Pyrenees the territory of France was extended and strengthened, particularly on that side, on which it was adjacent to the empire; and its superiority over the declining power of Spain was decisively established[27], more considerable cessions of territory having been obtained, than had even been demanded in the negotiations of Westphalia. Preparation was at the same time made, by a stipulation of a marriage between the infanta of Spain and the king of France, for an entire dissolution of the connexion of Spain and the empire. The Spaniards indeed required that the princess should solemnly renounce her right of succession, and they were less disinclined to consent, as a son had been born to the reigning king in the year 1657, and the queen had in the following year again become pregnant. In the year 1700 however the dauphin of France took possession of the Spanish throne in the alleged right of his mother the Spanish infanta, notwithstanding her renunciation; and the ascendency in the system of Europe was thus, after the struggle of the war of the Spanish succession, ascertained to the French government.

Portugal, which in the year 1580 had fallen under the dominion of Philip II. of Spain, had continued during sixty years subject to that country. Its emancipation was, not less than its previous subjugation, remarkably favoured by concurring circumstances. The Spanish government, exhausted by the ambition of its two earlier sovereigns of the Austrian family, the emperor Charles V. and his son Philip II., and having languished twenty-three years under the imbecility of the succeeding prince, Philip III., whose reign was a government of favourites, had become an unwieldly mass, the parts of which were retained in their positions rather by their inertness than by any active principle of con-

Marville, and their dependencies; and lastly, Marienburg, Philippeville, and Avesnes between the Sambre and the Meuse.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. pp. 175, 176.

[27] Ibid., p. 178.

nexion. At length, just when the dominion of Spain[28], oppressive though feeble, had sufficiently roused the indignation of the Portuguese, a general spirit of revolt appeared to have seized at once all the provinces of Spain, except Castile; but more especially in Catalonia, anciently distinguished by its independence, did this alarming indication of national decay present itself to observation. The revolt of Catalonia was at once a signal for the efforts of that people, and a diversion disabling their enemies for resistance, the insurrection being supported by France, then at war with Spain. An heir of the crown was at the same time presented in the duke of Braganza, whose quiet and unassuming temper[29] lulled to the last moment the anxious suspicions of the Spanish government, and yet could not obstruct the success of the enterprise, when actually commenced, the heroic spirit of his consort supplying the decisive energy, which in him would have been fatal to himself and to the revolution. In these circumstances Portugal without much difficulty again, in the year 1640, assumed its rank among the nations of Europe; but the confirmation of its independence was the result of a protracted war of twenty-eight years, the treaty of Lisbon, by which the Spaniards acknowledged it, not being concluded until the year 1668.

The temporary union of Portugal with Spain and the subsequent war of their separation formed an important crisis in the history of Europe, being regarded by all historians as affording the occasion of transferring to the new republic of the Dutch the valuable acquisitions of Portuguese enterprise in the east. The forcible conjunction of the two kingdoms of the Spanish peninsula had thus an influence in some degree analogous to that, which at the conclusion of the preceding century had been exercised on the commerce of Europe by the league of Cambrai. The war waged by the confederacy of Cambrai against Venice, the emporium of the commerce of the Mediterranean, facilitated the removal of the trade of India from that sea to the ocean; and the violences, practised by the Spaniards against the conquerors of so many valuable stations of commerce in India, facilitated not less directly another important step in the

[28] De la Clede, tome ii. pp. 395—402. [29] Ibid., pp. 405—407. Vertot's Account of the Revol. of Portugal.

progress of trade, by exposing the greater part of those stations to be transferred from the military people, which had wrested them from the Mohammedans, to the industrious and commercial people of the Dutch provinces. In its immediate character it may be compared to the union of Calmar, which gave a beginning to the system of the northern states of Europe; the Spanish union may in the like manner be considered as having given a beginning to the maritime system of the southern states.

The efforts of the Dutch were directed indiscriminately against all the colonial possessions of the Portuguese; but, whether it was that the American settlements, being less distant from the mother-country, were more easily protected, or that the administration of the government had been less corrupted[30], they finally failed in their attempts to become masters of Brazil. The primary possession of the precious metals of America was thus reserved to the two kingdoms of the Spanish peninsula; and it may deserve consideration whether this was not the best arrangement for the commercial interest of Europe, which assigned those treasures in the first instance to two kingdoms exhausted by the wasting influences of many causes, so that other nations, destitute themselves of any original supply of the precious metals, might acquire them from Spain and Portugal in just proportion to the activity and enterprise, which they exercised in trade.

The Catalonians, when they revolted, gave themselves to France; and in the negotiations of Westphalia the French ambassadors were instructed to maintain strenuously this acquisition. The French indeed[31] were not very sanguine in their expectation of retaining a possession, which they might lose, as they had acquired it, by a sudden revolution; but they proposed to themselves at all events, when they should have derived advantage from it in the prosecution of the war with Spain, to make a further advantage of it in the treaty, by selling it at a very great price. The postponement of the Spanish treaty however allowed time for a change in the relative situation of the two countries. The French had in the interval been driven out of the peninsula, and the treaty of the Pyrenees, concluded eleven years after that of West-

[30] De la Clede, tome ii. p. 684. [31] Bougeant, tome iii. pp. 17, &c.

phalia, while it ceded to the French the province of Roussillon, situated on the northern side of these mountains, constituted them the political, as they were the natural boundary of the two monarchies, and left the proper territory of the Spanish kingdom unimpaired. The temporary ascendency of France in Catalonia had sufficiently favoured the Portuguese revolution, which has been even thought to have been suggested by the French minister cardinal Richelieu[32]; and, though the war of Portugal was still continued, yet the new government had acquired strength sufficient for maintaining the contest without the aid of that diversion of the attention and efforts of the government of Spain, especially as France was not very scrupulous in observing the peace, which had been concluded, but contrived to furnish assistance to the enemy of her new ally.

The change of circumstances, which rendered the treaty of the Pyrenees so much less disadvantageous to Spain, was chiefly occasioned by the domestic disturbances of France, which began in the same year, in which the treaty of Westphalia was concluded, and were not composed until five years had elapsed. The internal commotions of France, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, preserved indeed a curious correspondence of time to the circumstances of the two governments of the house of Austria. Those of the *league*[33] had their origin in the year 1560, the year following that, in which the Spanish government began to provoke the insurrection of the Netherlands; and, though they were terminated in the year 1599, the government did not resume its energy before the year 1629, when the Protestants had been entirely reduced. France was thus rendered incapable of interposing inconveniently in the struggle of the Spaniards and the Dutch, but was ready for affording, without any domestic embarrassment, that assistance to the Protestants of Germany, which decided the issue of their struggle. Again, in the course of the exertions made by France to reduce the power of the house of Austria, an interest had been formed within the territory of Spain, which favoured the re-establishment of the Portuguese monarchy, but could not be preserved without proving fatal to the tranquillity

[32] Bougeant, tome i. pp. 443, 444. [33] Esprit de la Ligue, tome iii. pp. 348—350.

and the independence of Spain. In the same year accordingly, in which the peace of Westphalia was concluded, began another series of disturbances, distinguished by the name of the *fronde*, which reduced the pretensions of France to a moderation compatible with the integrity of one of the great sovereignties of Europe.

The peace of the Pyrenees preceded by nine years the treaty of Lisbon, which recognised the independence of Portugal, and established tranquillity between that country and Spain. During these nine years, France gave assistance to the Portuguese notwithstanding the peace concluded with Spain, but this assistance was far from being equally effectual as her open and avowed co-operation. In this altered state of the relation between France and Portugal we discover the principle of an important adjustment, of which our own government was the object. Alarmed at the danger[34], to which they were exposed by the peace, which France had concluded with their enemies, the Portuguese were driven to seek support from the English, and thus to begin a connexion, which has continued to our own time, and in the great struggle of the French revolution furnished the support of the operations of the English in the Spanish peninsula. A Portuguese princess, a part of whose portion was the settlement of Bombay in the East Indies, was accordingly offered in marriage to Charles II., who had been recently restored to the throne of England; and a close and intimate alliance was thus in the year 1661 formed between the two nations. They had been predisposed to this alliance by the war, which England had waged against Spain in the protectorate of Cromwell; and the French[35], in their anxiety to procure support for the Portuguese against the Spaniards, exerted their utmost influence to assist the negotiation.

It is remarkable in these arrangements that the same treaty, which eventually attached Spain to France, by preparing the way for the succession of the family of Bourbon to the throne of the former country, did also give occasion to a connexion of political interests, which attached Portugal to England, thus distributing the two kingdoms of the peninsula between the two leading governments, which after a few years with rival sway directed the system of Europe.

[34] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. pp. 179, 180. [35] Ibid.

Little did cardinal Mazarin with all his crafty policy apprehend, when he was assenting to the renunciation of the Spanish succession[36] with an intention of disregarding it, that he was by the same treaty assigning eventually to the rival government a countervailing accession.

The whole indeed of the varying relations between France and Portugal, during the long struggle between the latter country and Spain, appears to have borne such a correspondence to the changing circumstances of England, as might not embarrass the connexion of that country and Portugal. In the year 1640, when Portugal asserted her independence, England was incapacitated for affording assistance, the revolution of the one country having been begun in the very commencement of the disturbances of the other. At this time therefore it was unavoidable, that the office of supporting Portugal should devolve upon France. The avowed support of that country was however withdrawn by the peace of the Pyrenees, in the very year preceding the restoration of the monarchy, which enabled England to form her lasting alliance with Portugal, and France was even compelled by her own domestic troubles to favour the connexion. When at length, in the year 1667, this connexion had been so firmly established by nine years of co-operation against a common enemy, that it could not be endangered by a brief association with France, a war again broke out between that country and Spain, which determined the latter to conclude in the following year a peace with Portugal[37], as a distinct and sovereign state, though without a formal acknowledgment of its independence.

For completing the adjustment of the interests of southern Europe in this their earlier arrangement, it remained only that a peace should be concluded between Portugal and the Dutch republic, which was effected in the year 1669, the year following that which terminated the war of Portugal and Spain. It was natural that their common enmity against Spain should become a principle of union to these two states; and accordingly[38], in the year following the revolution, which gave independence to Portugal, a treaty was concluded, by which they became bound to afford reciprocal assistance against that government. But the harmony, then

[36] Henault, vol. ii. p. 138. [37] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. pp. 181, 182. [38] Ibid.

established between them, was confined to Europe, the avidity of commerce being too powerful for the sympathy of national independence, and controlling and modifying its operation. While they assisted each other against the Spaniards in Europe, they continued hostilities in the other regions of the globe; and in these distant struggles the Portuguese recovered Brazil and some of their settlements in Africa, and the Dutch prosecuted with success their enterprises in India, and acquired the important station of the Cape of Good Hope.

The treaty of Westphalia however, independently of these supplementary arrangements, may fairly be considered as constituting the epoch of the earlier and preparatory adjustment of the political relations of Europe. By that treaty a balance was formed within the empire, inasmuch as the Roman Catholics were reduced in importance by an extensive secularisation of ecclesiastical property, the greater part of which was transferred to the Protestants, and as these were admitted to an equal participation of the tribunals and the diet, and were united in one body under the electoral family of Saxony, the Calvinists being included in the treaty. An external balance was at the same time formed between Austria and France, as the latter obtained passages into Germany and Italy, and might at all times, in the character of a guarantee of the treaty, take advantage of the regulations constituting the internal balance of the empire, for detaching the minor states from their chief, and forming a powerful party against the emperor. The house of Austria, though much reduced in power, was still predominant; but France was by the treaty of Westphalia placed in the situation of a countervailing government, which should control and restrain its encroachments.

Spain, the dominion of the elder branch of the house of Austria, had from the close of the reign of Philip II. made a rapid progress in decay. Philip III., the son and successor of that prince, had in the year 1610 consummated the misgovernment of the kingdom, by expelling from it the industrious Moors. Ten years afterwards he endeavoured to induce his Christian subjects[39], by offering the honours of

[39] Abrégé Chron. de l'Hist. d'Espagne et de Portugal, tome II. p. 472. Paris, 1765.

nobility and an exemption from military service, to engage in the cultivation of the lands left waste by that measure, but their characteristic indolence prevailed against the royal edict. Philip IV., who succeeded to the throne in the year 1621, reposing his entire confidence in the vigorous genius of count Olivarez, some energy was infused into the government, just sufficient for enabling it to maintain its part of the struggle of the house of Austria in the war of Germany. The effort however increased the exhaustion of the nation, like those which are excited in an animal body by some stimulating medicine. The rich fabrics of silk and wool having all been ruined[40], the minister found himself reduced to the necessity of publishing sumptuary regulations, as in a petty and indigent state; and the master of the mines of Mexico and Peru was forced to coin money of copper, assigning to it a value nearly equal to that of silver, that he might free himself from the claims of the creditors of the state. At the death of Philip IV.[41], which occurred in the year 1665, the population of the country was perceptibly impaired; the cultivation of the earth was neglected; the marine was not supplied with sailors; arts, manufactures, and commerce had perished. The succeeding reign of Charles II. was a long period of continually increasing debility, terminated at the close of the seventeenth century by the extinction of the Austrian dynasty.

Though the principal monarchy of the Spanish peninsula was, in the beginning of the succeeding century, restored in some small degree by the new vigour infused by a change of dynasty and political relations, on the advancement of a prince of the family of Bourbon, yet both kingdoms have continued to the present time of little importance in comparison with other nations. The spirit of the Spanish peninsula had been exhausted, as that of the Italian had been before, and each was disqualified for maintaining with vigour the combinations of the growing system. Italy had been distinguished by an extraordinary excitement of mental activity, which was naturally succeeded by a political, intellectual, and moral debility. The exciting principle of the

[40] Abrégé Chron. de l'Hist. d'Espagne et de Portugal, tome ii. p. 499. [41] Ibid., p. 561.

Spanish peninsula was a martial bigotry, inspired by the long crusade, which had been waged against the Arabs and the Moors. As this principle could not be reconciled to the permanent interests of mankind, so it contained in itself the sure influence of political debasement and decay. The bigotry of Spain first drove from it the industrious part of its inhabitants, and then subdued in the remainder every energy of mental and moral activity. What could be hoped of a nation so depraved, that at the marriage of Charles II.[42], in the year 1680, an *auto-da-fe*, that utmost outrage of the laws of God and man, was deemed a suitable expression of the public satisfaction, and twenty-two victims committed to the flames, with sixty others condemned to corporal punishments, were presented as a spectacle worthy of the joyful occasion?

Spain still retained its hold of Italy, but like an exhausted combatant fainting over the body of an antagonist, who had already expired. That country was indeed from this time indebted for protection to the rivalry of France and Austria, the remaining force of Spain being by the change of its dynasty transferred to the former of these two governments. The immediate interest of the papacy had ceased to influence the councils of nations, and its independence was thenceforward maintained in common with the other parts of a general system of equilibrium.

Though Italy and Spain were thus deprived of their importance, the general system of Europe was notwithstanding improving its arrangements, and these countries sunk into decay only when they had discharged their functions, and their continued activity would have embarrassed the operations of other governments. That parts of a moral system should occasionally disappear from the general combination, is analogous to the changes observed by astronomers in the material universe, in which stars appear and vanish, and a planet has been supposed to have been shattered into fragments. That such vicissitudes of nations may form a part of the providential government of the world, has been attested by the apostle, who has expressly represented "the fall of the Jews" as "the riches of the world." Since the rejection even of the chosen people has been thus pronounced to have

[42] Abrégé Chron. de l'Hist. d'Espagne et de Portugal, tome ii. p. 578.

been a measure of the divine economy in a great plan of religion, we may well admit the degraded condition of exhausted nations among the combinations of a system of general improvement.

CHAPTER VIII.

Of the history of the northern governments of Europe, from the commencement of the war of thirty years, in the year 1618, *to the treaties of Oliva and Copenhagen, concluded in the year* 1660.

War of Poland with the Cossacks in the year 1638—War with Sweden begun, 1655—Treaties of Oliva and Copenhagen concluded, and the Danish monarchy absolute, 1660—Des Cartes.

At the beginning of the war of thirty years the two kingdoms of Denmark and Sweden, though both had been consolidated and strengthened in the long period of ninety-four years, which had elapsed since the dissolution of the union of Calmar, were yet as contrasted in both their internal and external conditions, as their subsequent relations to the general interests of Europe were different in their nature and importance. Denmark was governed by an aristocracy under the form of a monarchy, and experienced the blended advantage and mischief of such a government; it was restrained by the prudence of its senate from engaging, like Sweden, in schemes of military enterprise, and it was disabled by the aristocratic prejudices of the nobles for prosecuting its commercial interest. In Sweden on the contrary the sovereign beheld all the resources of the country placed at his uncontrolled disposal. While this state of the government particularly fitted Sweden for military exertions, its political relations most forcibly stimulated and excited them. It was not only galled by the vicinage of the Danes, who still held possession of the southern provinces of the Scandinavian peninsula, but had been engaged in expeditions beyond the Baltic, in consequence of the dissolution of the union, which

had for a short time connected it with Poland. Denmark was on the other hand disengaged from all connexions, which might afford excitement for military enterprise, being neither pressed at home by the vicinity of any formidable power, nor involved in any national contention with a distant government.

Denmark was however the first to interpose in the war of Germany; nor did Gustavus Adolphus lead his forces into the empire, until the Danes had been overpowered, and compelled to conclude a humiliating peace. The Swedish king was willing indeed to interfere in the very commencement of the war, but he was then engaged in another war with Poland, from which he could not withdraw his forces, until the French had mediated a treaty between him and that power, that he might turn his arms against the emperor. When the war had continued seven years, the king of Denmark caused himself to be declared captain-general of the circle of Lower Saxony, of which he was a member as duke of Holstein: four years afterwards he found it necessary to withdraw from the contest, being overpowered by the imperial forces; and in the following year the king of Sweden, being disengaged from the war of Poland, conducted an army into Germany.

This unsuccessful interposition of Denmark served to prepare the way for the effectual interference of Sweden. The duchy of Holstein, by connecting the former with the empire, procured a favourable reception of the Danish army, as it caused the king to be regarded as a prince of Germany. The Germans thus became accustomed to the interposition of one, who was really a foreign potentate, from which they had to advance but one step for admitting that of the Swedish monarch, who did not then possess any German territory. Even after this preparation the enterprise of Sweden was difficult and embarrassing. Gustavus advanced into Germany without any other co-operation[1], than that which was afforded by France; nor was it until the following year, that the two northern electors of Brandenburg and Saxony were reluctantly induced to unite themselves with this foreign leader. If the Swedish king had marched his army into Germany without such preparation, the jealousy of the Germans would

[1] Bougeant, tome i. pp. 160, &c.

have resisted his progress, and they would perhaps have even exhausted their forces against him, abandoning in the mean time their domestic contest with the emperor.

The interposition of Sweden in the war of Germany appears to have had a remote relation to the subsequent operations of that government against Russia. The wars of Gustavus formed the preparation for those of Charles XII., by which the Russians were afterwards schooled into military exertion, as his conquest of the province, by which Russia then communicated with the Baltic, actually presented to the future czar the great object of his struggle with the latter monarch. Denmark on the other hand seems to have exercised the function of forming the power of Sweden, by pressing upon it through the possession of various provinces within its natural boundary, by holding it in thraldom during the compulsory union of Calmar, and by conveying to the Scandinavian peninsula a knowledge of the improvement of Germany, especially of the reformation of religion, while it was disqualified for acting powerfully on Russia with a military force, at once by its remote position, the naval habits of its people, and the aristocratic character of its government. The immediate operation however of the interposition of Sweden appears to have consisted in preparing the way for the connexion of the German Protestants with France.

The early interposition of the Danes, besides that it introduced the Swedes into Germany, was important, as it served to remove them from the contest, and thus to leave the field open for the efforts of Gustavus. Such was the deeply-rooted jealousy of these two rival nations of the north, that it was not practicable to bring them into co-operation in the German war. We know that in its conclusion, when the Danes had offered themselves as mediators, their partiality irritated the Swedes[2], and that at length some hostilities, exercised against the Swedish commerce, gave occasion to an open war, by which these were disengaged from a mediation so ineligible. By the early disasters of the Danes therefore, we must conclude, a jealous rival was removed from the field of action, and the Swedes were left at liberty to exert their whole power in opposition to the efforts of the emperor, and of the German states attached to his cause.

[2] Bougeant, tome i. p. 542. Mallet, tome viii. pp. 72—76.

The interposition of the Danes had also an operation on the measures of the imperial court, which assisted in bringing forward the crisis of the war. That war has been distinguished into four periods, in the first of which it was merely German, and in the others the Danes, the Swedes, and the French successively interposed. The first of these terminated in the establishment of the uncontrolled ascendency of the imperial power within the limits of the empire. Even then indeed a very general apprehension of the ambition of Austria was diffused throughout Europe, and the negotiations[3], which this alarm occasioned in every court, were the seeds of the powerful confederacies afterwards formed. This apprehension, which had been only the anticipation of possible danger, until the Danish power had been crushed at the conclusion of the second period, appeared to be realised when the emperor, encouraged by his triumph over the Danes, was no longer contented with the destruction of the liberties of Germany, but aspired to the sovereignty of the Baltic. New and more powerful exertions had then become necessary for resisting his usurpations, and a combination was accordingly effected, which at once established the liberties of the empire, and effected the primary adjustment of the policy of Europe.

For comprehending the bearing of the short, but decisive war, in which the Swedes indulged their jealousy of Denmark, it is necessary to consider the situation of the latter government, as commanding the entrance of the Baltic, and as still possessing the maritime provinces of the present territory of Sweden. In the former relation the general interests of commerce were involved; in the latter the growing greatness of Sweden was concerned.

The king of Denmark[4], straightened in his revenue, even more than in his prerogative, and perhaps instigated by a jealousy of the prosperity of the Dutch and of the Swedes, had further augmented the duties of the passage of the Sound, which had been continually and rapidly increased since the commencement of the sixteenth century. Influenced by this grievance, together with other interests, the Swedes, though still engaged in the war of Germany, determined to make a sudden attack upon the Danes. The actual circumstances

[3] Bougeant, tome i. p. 106. [4] Mallet, tome viii. pp. 52, 53, 72.

of Denmark were most favourable to the success of the enterprise. The Danes had been disarmed by a peace of fourteen years; they could not be persuaded that Sweden would undertake another war[5], while that of Germany was yet undecided; the government was distracted by the enmity of two rival ministers[6]; and the nobles were more solicitous to control their sovereign, than to provide for the defence of their country. In this emergency the country was saved from subjugation by the unconquerable resolution of the king[7]; but a peace was unavoidably concluded on disadvantageous terms. A reduction of the duties of the Sound[8], with other commercial advantages, was conceded to the Dutch, whom it was necessary to detach from the interests of the Swedes; and to the latter were then granted an entire exemption from the Danish tolls, and, besides some islands in the Baltic[9], a part of the provinces, which the crown of Denmark possessed within the present boundaries of Sweden.

By the conditions of this peace, concluded in the year 1645, the general interest of commerce was favoured in the relaxation of the claim of duties, exacted by the Danes; and the growing government of Sweden was allowed to expand itself in the acquisition of a wider territory, and to connect itself with the opposite border of the Baltic by the possession of the intermediate islands, particularly of the isle of Oesel on the coast of Livonia.

The disasters of the Danish government did not end with these concessions. From the conclusion indeed of the peace in the year 1645, the hostility of the two rival kingdoms was suspended during twelve years; but, at the expiration of this period of tranquillity, the Danes were tempted to endeavour to recover the advantages, which they had been compelled to relinquish. The situation of Sweden[10], involved in a furious war with Poland, seemed to present a favourable opportunity for retrieving the losses of the former contest, and for re-

[5] Mallet, tome viii. p. 75. [6] Ibid., p. 73. [7] Ibid., p. 92.
[8] Ibid., pp. 125, 126, 129—132. [9] The islands were Gothland with its dependent isles, and Oesel on the coast of Livonia also with its dependencies. The territories ceded on the continent were the province of Jemptelande, with that part of Herndale which is on the eastern side of the mountains; and also during thirty years the possession of Halland, as a security for the exemptions allowed to the commerce of Sweden.—Ibid., pp. 131, 132. [10] Ibid., pp. 241, 242.

pressing a power, which had long yielded the superiority to Denmark, but had latterly held it as it were invested by its own recent acquisitions in Germany[11], and by connexions formed with the ducal family of Holstein[12]. The result was yet more ruinous to the Danes than the preceding contest. The king of Sweden, glad to have found a pretext for withdrawing his forces from Poland[13], marched immediately into Jutland, and from the peninsula, favoured by a season of extraordinary severity, he conducted them across the frozen passages of the Baltic into Zealand. A peace was in consequence concluded at an inconsiderable distance from the capital, by which, besides other concessions[14], the remainder of the Danish territory within the present limits of Sweden was ceded, and that country attained its full dimensions. The provisions of this treaty were two years afterwards

[11] Sweden obtained by the treaty of Westphalia the Hither, with a part of the Further Pomerania, the isle of Rugen, the city and port of Wismar with some bailliages of Mecklenburg, and the archbishopric of Bremen with the bishopric of Verden, both secularised, all to be held as a state of the empire, with a triple voice in the diets for Bremen, Verden, and Pomerania. A great part of these acquisitions was lost in consequence of the unfortunate enterprises of Charles XII. The duchies of Bremen and Verden were in the year 1719 ceded to the king of England, as elector of Hanover, and in the following year the city of Stettin, with the part of Pomerania lying between the Oder and the Peene, was ceded to the king of Prussia.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. pp. 158, 159. [12] The family of Oldenburg, elevated to the throne of Denmark in the year 1448, acquired by succession the two duchies of Sleswic and Holstein, the former of which was a fief of Denmark, the latter of the empire. In the year 1544 they were granted by Christian III. to his two brothers John and Adolphus, but to be held as one united principality; and John having died without issue, his territory was in the year 1581 divided between the king and the duke of Holstein. The grandson of Adolphus, Frederic III., formed a connexion with Sweden by marrying his daughter to Charles X. of that country, and availed himself of this connexion to assert his independence of the king of Denmark in regard to the duchy of Sleswic. By the treaty of Copenhagen the duchy of Holstein was rendered independent of Denmark, and the connexion of Denmark with Germany was wholly dissolved.—Ibid., tome iii. pp. 223—227. [13] Mallet, tome viii. p. 242. [14] Schonen, Bleckingen, and Halland, were ceded to Sweden. By this treaty, which has been named the treaty of Roschild, the province of Drontheim in Norway was also ceded to Sweden; but it was relinquished by that crown in the subsequent treaty of Copenhagen, which thus preserved the integrity of the Norwegian territory.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome iii. pp. 98, 111.

modified by the treaty of Copenhagen, concluded in the year 1660, under the mediation of France, England, and the Dutch republic, when the relative condition of the two governments was permanently arranged.

The Danish government appears to have inclosed within itself the germ of the Swedish monarchy, and, by a process resembling the developement of vegetable productions, to have gradually yielded to its pressure, and at length to have allowed space for its maturity. The analogy will appear more perfect, when it shall have been considered that, this function having been discharged, it experienced an essential alteration of its own constitution, all the elastic principles of its formation withering immediately into a simple despotism, as the petals including the seed-vessels of a plant are deprived of their bloom and their consistency.

The calamities, so grievously experienced by Denmark, were in a principal degree occasioned[15] by the radical weakness of a usurping and divided aristocracy; and in both its severe trials[16] the public safety had been the work of the personal qualities of the sovereign. A reaction was at length generated by the continuance of a system of government, which had proved itself fatally injurious. The voices of the commons[17] and of the clergy, who since the reformation[18] had been taken chiefly from the commons, were raised against the nobles, as the authors of the public ruin; and in the violence of civil dissension, and ignorance of the true principles of a balanced government, no expedient of relief presented itself, except a solemn and authentic surrender of the public liberties into the hands of the prince. Such was the influence of a diversity of political circumstances, that within twenty-nine years before the English government effected its adjustment at its memorable revolution, that of a country, from which its principles of liberty had been derived, became merged in an unqualified despotism by the most formal abdication of the public rights.

Mr. Sheridan, in his history of a similar revolution, which, one hundred and twelve years afterwards[19], was effected in

[15] Mallet, tome viii. p. 168. [16] Ibid., pp. 92, 286, 338, 365. [17] Ibid., p. 291. [18] Ibid., tome ix. p. 14. [19] A revolution similar to that of Denmark occurred in Sweden twenty years after that of the Danish government, and from the operation of a similar

the neighbouring kingdom of Sweden, has made reflections, which may explain the bearing of this change of the Danish government. If, says he[20], the king of Sweden destroyed the constitution, he preserved the independence of his country, the government of which had long been efficient only in rendering it subservient to the interested cabals of other powers. The history of Sweden has indeed sufficiently proved, that a small monarchy cannot maintain the freedom of a balanced government, uninfluenced by the disturbing action of the neighbouring states, as the extinction of the independence of Poland has proved, that even a large one may be totally destroyed by it, when the existence of great popular privileges allows it to be exerted without restraint. The chief function, which Denmark has since discharged in the general system, has been the preservation of the balance of the Baltic, and with it of the freedom of commerce. To this function the independence of the government was indispensable; and the change of the constitution, by annihilating the organs through which the intrigues of foreign powers might influence the government, maintained that independence inviolate, until it was overborne by the aggrandisement of Russia.

The royal authority in Denmark, though from this time not controlled by the laws, was yet restrained by the manners of the people, who retained the qualities of a free nation. The revolution of the year 1660 was not the result of a servile submission, but was in reality an insurrection against the dominion of the nobles: and the people accordingly looked to their sovereign as a protector against a galling oppression. Though the freedom of the constitution was lost, the sentiment of personal freedom remained, because a victory had been achieved over an aristocratic tyranny. The sovereign therefore, though declared absolute by the law, found it necessary to consult the feelings of the people; and the government of Denmark, destitute as it was of all the institutions, which have been devised for securing the interests of a people, was yet administered with

cause, the jealousy entertained by the people against the nobles. But the arbitrary power of the king, then established, ceased at the death of Charles XII., when it had subsisted thirty-eight years.—Sheridan's Hist. of the late Revol. in Sweden, pp. 160—163.

[20] Ibid., p. 403.

a parental moderation, which qualified its arbitrary character. Nor is the merit of this mild government limited to the parental moderation of its character, for, in the year 1705, it gave a beginning, at its little settlement of Tranquebar, to the Protestant mission of India, and in the present age is honourably distinguished by its encouragement of science. The history of polite learning in that country is indeed[21] said to have been limited to the life of an individual, baron Holberg, who died in the year 1754.

The throne of Sweden, seven years before the commencement of the great war of Germany, had been ascended by Gustavus Adolphus. Occupied by a war with Poland, this prince was not at liberty to engage in that of Germany, until the latter had raged during twelve years; but, while the delay allowed time for the trial of Denmark in the contest, it also served as a special preparation for the subsequent efforts of Sweden, since in this war with Poland[22] the Swedish prince formed several regiments of German infantry. The Poles[23] had been diverted from negotiating with the Swedes by the intrigues of the Austrian court, anxious to maintain a diversion for the arms of Gustavus; their resources were however at length exhausted, and France and her allies, with a contrary policy, succeeded in mediating a long suspension of hostilities[24].

Just at the time, when the forces of Sweden were thus disengaged, motives both of a political and of a personal nature co-operated with the ambition of the Swedish monarch, to excite him to the great enterprise of his reign. The emperor, elated by the triumph obtained over Denmark, had manifested[25] alarming views of aggrandisement in the north of Europe, and in his negotiation with the Danes had refused to admit the presence of the Swedish ambassadors[26]. The imperial party had affected to treat with contempt[27] 'this king of snow, who must melt in the spring;' but they soon discovered that all seasons were alike to their northern

[21] Prior's Life of Goldsmith, vol. i. p. 172. Lond. 1837.
[22] Puffen., tome ii., p. 235. [23] Ibid., p. 238. [24] A truce of six years was then concluded. The Swedes purchased a renewal of it for twenty-six years by the cession of Prussia. Ibid., p. 326.
[25] Bougeant, tome i., p. 150. [26] Ibid., p. 134. [27] Ibid., p. 188.

enemy[28], neither summer nor winter suspending his operations.

The career of Gustavus in Germany was short, having been terminated, after about two years and a half, at the battle of Lutzen, in which however his troops obtained a victory. His death produced an important change in the government of Sweden, by devolving it to a female and a minor, his daughter Christina. The habits of the people had however been too well formed, in the long course of discipline, by which they had been trained for military enterprise, to permit their operations of this kind to depend on the life of an individual. The war was accordingly prosecuted sixteen years more, the pupils of the heroic Gustavus supporting by their skill and energy the credit of their master.

But though the death of this prince did not interrupt the prosecution of hostilities, it altered the character of the war from a struggle of ambitious aggrandisement to a prudential perseverance in efforts for obtaining an honourable peace. This change was necessary for permitting the direct and avowed interposition of the French in the war of Germany. Gustavus, who aspired to place himself on the throne of the empire[29], was so adverse to the claim of superiority, advanced by the French[30] in their negotiation with him, that a treaty of subsidy was concluded with considerable difficulty. Even after the death of their prince the Swedes[31] were not brought to solicit the direct co-operation of that people, until a defeat, sustained in the year 1634, had convinced them of their own insufficiency to encounter the imperialists; and such was the difficulty of the arrangement, that it was not concluded, even for three years, until the year 1637, nor for the continuance of the war, until this period had expired. The death of Gustavus introduced the French into the war, as the overthrow of Denmark had before introduced Sweden, but with this difference, that the Swedes were not, like the Danes, removed from the scene of action.

While the death of this prince was thus accommodated to the bearing of the German war, the accession of Chris-

[28] Bougeant, tome i. p. 184. [29] Puffen., tome ii. pp. 277—294.
[30] Ibid., p. 259. [31] Ibid., pp. 321, 341, 342, 360.

tina was not less suited to the domestic improvement of Sweden, which was shortly to give a strong impulse to that of the yet barbarous empire of Russia. Her reign was the period of the intellectual refinement of a remote and military people, without which indeed they might have exercised upon Russia all the influence of external hostility, but could scarcely have imparted at the same time any knowledge of the attainments of the more civilised societies of Europe. Long and uninterruptedly occupied by domestic or foreign war, the Swedes were in danger of becoming a nation of disciplined barbarians, powerful in mere violence, but little capable of communicating the refinements of cultivated life. In this crisis appeared the enthusiastic patroness of learning and learned men, to give Sweden a rank among the enlightened nations of the world. Denmark had in the remote island of Iceland a peculiar source of learning, and by a communication with Germany could derive improvement also from the southern countries of Europe: but Sweden must have remained in nearly all its native rudeness, if the reign of Christina had not been interposed, for inviting into it the refinement of other states, and rendering more close and intimate that connexion with France, which had been begun by the treaty of subsidy concluded in the year 1631. Christina in the interesting memoir of herself[32], which she has dedicated to God, has remarked that her sex, though she thought of it with little respect, served to protect her from the national intemperance.

A long enumeration might be made of the learned men and artists, who experienced the protection of Christina. One of the more distinguished of the former was Grotius, the original author of the law of nations, and eminent also for his attainments in polite learning. He indeed had been taken by her father Gustavus under his protection just before his death, but continued to receive from the Swedish court, and from the queen, when capable of appreciating his merit, the same favourable regard. Of those invited into Sweden by Christina, the most remarkable was Des Cartes, who may be considered as the immediate precursor

[32] Mem. concernant Christine, tome iii. p. 23. Amst. et Leipzig, 1751—1759.

of the modern philosophy. Though the researches of Des Cartes were much perverted by hypothetical speculation, he presented to the world a bold example of the rejection of prevailing opinions, he enriched geometry and mechanics with many valuable discoveries, and became the father of the modern metaphysics, by resolving to begin with inquiring into the certainty of his own existence[33]. To these superior men may be added D'Herbelot and Bochart, both distinguished by their acquaintance with the learning of the east, the latter having directed his efforts to the illustration of the Bible, the former having in his *Bibliothèque Orientale* furnished a treasure of information relative to the modern learning of Asia. The queen, while she invited and rewarded learned men, was careful to provide also the instruments of learning, expending money with a profuse liberality in the purchase of books[34], and in forming a very curious collection of medals.

The female reign of Christina naturally suggests a comparison with that of Elizabeth of England, who had died thirty years before the accession of the Swedish queen. A female reign seems to have been advantageous to each people, as it tended to mitigate the severity of their general manners. To the English it appears to have been useful in counteracting the growing fanaticism of the Puritans, to the Swedes in correcting the ferocity resulting from long-continued hostilities. This is however the single point of correspondence. Both reigns were indeed supported by able ministers: but Burleigh was selected by the wisdom, and maintained in power by the vigour of Elizabeth, where-

[33] His argument for establishing this fundamental proposition was, 'I think, therefore I am.' It is however assumed in the little word *I*. But, though he was thus scrupulous in requiring a proof even of his own existence, he yet persuaded himself that men have an innate knowledge of the existence of God, from which our conviction in regard to all other external existence could alone be derived.—Bruckeri, tome v., pp. 291—304. Des Cartes was born in France, in the year 1596, and died in Sweden, in the year 1650. From France he had retired to Holland, that he might construct in leisure his system of philosophy.

[34] Her library, at her abdication, was grievously pillaged by the French scholars, whom she had assembled at her court, and was finally gleaned by Isaac Vossius, to whom the care of collecting it had been chiefly intrusted.—Mem. concernant Christine, tome i. pp. 271—273, 283.

as Oxenstiern had been bequeathed to Christina by her father, and upheld himself by the energy of his own superior mind. The reign of Christina again, during the ten years in which she was competent to direct the government, was a period of royal patronage of learning; but Elizabeth, though herself learned, and though on account of the general excitement of the minds of her people her reign has been considered as the golden age of English literature, does not appear to have regarded the encouragement of learning as a special object of her care. Another remarkable distinction is that feminine feelings were blended with the great qualities of the English queen, but Christina, whom her father had directed to be educated as a prince, not a female[35], disdained the coquetry, and even the manners of her sex. Each was however suited to the circumstances in which she was placed. Christina in particular was well qualified to effect a sudden introduction of mental cultivation among a military people. Her masculine mind could embrace with ardour all the objects of intellectual refinement, while, as a female, she could devolve much of the cares of state upon her able minister, devoting her chief attention to the improvement of her own genius, and of that of her subjects[36].

The love of intellectual refinement appears to have at length become a passion, which Christina was unable to control, and to have determined her to abdicate the throne of Sweden, that she might seek in countries more improved, particularly in Italy, the enjoyment which she so prized. It is supposed that her desire of living in Italy without disturbance, and of securing the protection of the pontiff, was her motive for renouncing the protestant religion in her progress through Germany. There is indeed good reason for believing[37], that she had previously learned to be so in-

[35] Mem. concernant Christine, tome iii. p. 52. [36] To Swedish genius, thus cultivated, the commonwealth of Europe has in the succeeding century become indebted for the sexual system of Linné or Linnæus, who, by arranging plants according to the analogies of the parts of fructification, has created botany. The plan of his system was formed in the year 1729; his great work, the *Species Plantarum*, appeared in the year 1753. [37] Christina is said to have learned infidelity particularly from Vossius, of whom Charles II. of England, when he had heard him relate some incredible stories concerning

different to revealed religion, that she may well be supposed to have consulted in this particular her present convenience. Whatever may have been her motive, her conduct was beneficial as it rendered her abdication irrevocable. Christina appears to have in some instances forgotten[38], that she had ceased to be a queen; and it is not improbable, that she might have seriously endeavoured to reascend that throne, which she had quitted at the early age of twenty-eight years, if some insurmountable impediment had not been interposed. The returning ambition of this princess was accordingly exhaled in a vain attempt to obtain the crown of Poland, to which her religion did not present an impediment; and, except in this enterprise, she passed the thirty-four years, which followed her abdication, in collecting about her a society of the learned[39].

The reign of Christina had continued only five years after the termination of the German war. So little however was even this short interval of tranquillity adapted to the habits and character of the Swedes, that in the very commencement of the reign of her successor a formal deliberation was held by the states[40], whether the arms of Sweden should be directed against the Danes, the Russians, or the Poles. The Danes and the Russians, it was acknowledged, had afforded no pretext for hostilities. Against the Poles might be alleged their refusal to renounce their claim to the throne of Sweden, together with some infractions of the existing treaty. War was accordingly commenced against the Poles, at this time distressed by the attacks of other enemies, and unable to offer any effectual resistance.

China, very happily remarked that he believed every thing except the Bible.—Mem. concernant Christine, tome i. pp. 274, 275. The queen described herself in the year 1655, as hearing no more sermons, but passing her time in eating and amusements, all other occupations being vanity, for which she quoted Solomon.—Ibid., p. 475.

[38] At Fontainbleau, in the year 1657, she caused the marquess Monaldeschi, her grand equerry, to be put to death for some acts of treachery in regard to her correspondence; and in the year 1662 she despatched a minister to several courts, with a design of uniting them in a confederacy against the Turks. — Ibid., tome ii. pp. 2, 71.

[39] From this assemblage was afterwards derived the Italian society of the *Arcadi*, which during some years held its meetings in the gardens of the palace, previously occupied by Christina, when she resided in Rome.—Ibid., p. 137.

[40] Puffen., tome iii. p. 2.

The Cossacks of the Ukraine, originally Russian refugees mixed with some Tatar tribes[41], but received under the protection of Poland, as a useful barrier against the Tatars and Turks, had admitted and sheltered a multitude of peasants[42], who had fled from the oppressions of the Polish nobles. War was accordingly declared against them in the year 1638, and prosecuted with violence during sixteen years, at the end of which time the Russians availed themselves of the favourable opportunity for renewing hostilities. In this crisis of the public distress the king of Sweden began his war with Poland. The Polish sovereign, abandoned by his nobles and his troops, was forced to flee into Silesia, and throughout the whole kingdom Dantzic alone offered any resistance to the victorious Swedes. As if to complete the subjugation of the Poles, the prince of Transylvania brought a numerous army to the assistance of their enemies, hoping to be elevated to the throne of the vanquished nation.

But the exactions of the Swedes soon roused in the minds of the Poles a spirit of determined resistance[43], and the balancing principle of European policy began immediately to shew itself in favour of a nation so suddenly reduced. The Danes, neighbours and natural rivals of the Swedes, were the first who appeared against them; the Russians and the imperialists of Germany contributed their assistance; the Dutch sent a squadron to the relief of Dantzic; and the Turks at the same time turned their arms against the prince of Transylvania. The result of these various movements was the peace concluded in the year 1660 at Oliva, in the vicinity of Dantzic[44], which, as it was itself an effect of the balancing principle, has constituted, together with that of Copenhagen[45], which was also a result of the inter-

[41] Levesque, tome iv. p. 54. [42] Abrégé Chron. de l'Hist. du Nord par Lacombe, tome ii. pp. 604—611. Amsterdam, 1763.

[43] Hist. of Poland, pp. 163—165. [44] By this treaty Poland ceded to Sweden Livonia and Esthonia, with the dependent isles, reserving only some places in the southern part of the former territory.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome iii. pp. 124, 125; Tableau des Revol. de l'Europe, tome ii. p. 241. [45] The king of Denmark, desirous of being included in the treaty of Oliva, sent a minister to the congress, but the Poles, eager to conclude a peace with Sweden, refused to admit any discussion by which it might be retarded. A clause was how-

position of other governments[46], the epoch of the international history of the north.

Before the conclusion of this peace Poland had been the predominant power in the north of Europe[47]. The ascendency was by the peace of Oliva transferred to Sweden[48], which maintained it during sixty-one years. At the end of that period it was transferred to Russia, which from this time has continued to increase in strength and importance. From the peace of Oliva may be dated, for the north of Europe, a period corresponding to that, which among the southern states was commenced from the peace of Westphalia, these treaties having been respectively the epochs of the formation of the northern and southern systems of Europe. As before the peace of Westphalia there had been no regularly adjusted combination of the southern go-

ever inserted, by which it was provided that, when a peace should have been concluded between Sweden and Denmark, the latter should be considered as comprehended in the treaty.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome iii. pp. 118, 126. These northern negotiations, like those of Westphalia, were managed in two separate congresses, on account of the difficulty of comprehending the various interests in a single arrangement.

[46] The treaty of Copenhagen was concluded under the mediation of France, England, and the Dutch republic.

[47] Ibid., p. 3.

[48] Livonia, says Koch, was the apple of discord, which excited contention among the powers of the north. Such, he adds, was the advantage of its position, and such the fertility of its soil, that by the possession of this territory we may judge, which of these powers predominated. The master of the order of the Sword-bearers, by whom it had been held under the Teutonic order, asserted his independence in the year 1521, and was by the emperor Charles V. admitted to the diet as a prince of the empire. In the year 1561 the grand-master, for so he was entitled since the independence of Livonia, submitted his province to Poland, being unable to defend it against the Russians. While he treated with Poland, the city of Revel and the nobles of Esthonia renounced their obedience to him, and submitted themselves to Sweden. The Danes had in the preceding year obtained a share of this country, the bishop of Oesel, wearied of the public agitations, having sold this bishopric and another to their sovereign, who assigned them as an appanage to his brother. This prince also acquired for himself a third bishopric, and a castle with its territory. Livonia thus became the subject and the scene of long contentions among the Russians, the Poles, the Swedes, and the Danes, which were composed by various treaties, ending with that of Oliva, when the dominion of it was assigned to Sweden.—Ibid., pp. 3—10.

vernments, so neither before that of Oliva had the political relations of the northern governments assumed a determinate arrangement.

The northern system has not been at any time so perfect as that of the south, since it never exhibited a balance of power, but was merely a combination of one principal nation and of some others ministering to its greatness. It was in truth but an appendage to the grand system of the southern nations, making preparation for the movements of a later period, in which all should be combined to form one comprehensive arrangement of policy. It may however be remarked, that there was, in the progressive formation of the northern system, a correspondence to the order observable in that of the south, for in each the ascendency was first held by a power different from that, which by its physical resources was best qualified to maintain a lasting predominance. As Austria by the treaty of Westphalia held a temporary ascendency, which it then yielded to France, so did Sweden by the treaty of Oliva possess a predominance in the northern system, which it afterwards conceded to Russia.

It is a curious circumstance, that the same point of time, which thus marks the commencement of the political depression of Poland, was also the epoch of that organised anarchy of its civil constitution, which at length destroyed its national existence, the *liberum veto*, that tribunitial right of every individual of its multitude of nobles, having been then introduced[49]. And it is also a remarkable fact, that the unhappy sovereign of that country did even then foresee[50], and forewarn the assembled diet, that the dissensions of Poland would terminate in its political extinction, and even that it would be partitioned by Russia, Brandenburg, and Austria. Poland appears to have discharged its functions, and to have prepared itself for retiring from the struggles of nations, like Italy and Spain among the southern governments.

[49] Hist. of Poland, p. 169. [50] It is remarkable that the monarch did not comprehend the Swedes in his prediction of a partition, though that people was then predominant in the north, and some years before had overthrown Poland, and agreed upon a partition of it with Brandenburg.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome iii. p. 115.

Russia was in the same time beginning to emerge from the calamities, by which it had been overwhelmed during eight years. The temporary depression of Russia had allowed Poland to perform without interruption its part in the combinations, in which it was engaged with Germany and Sweden. The decline of Poland having been begun from the treaty of Oliva, and no reason any longer requiring that the aggrandisement of Russia should be impeded, that country began again to rise to greatness, though not with the rapidity, which has latterly drawn upon it the attention of Europe.

The period of time at present considered, was in Russia occupied by parts of the reigns of two sovereigns, Michael and Alexis, the former having begun his reign five years before the commencement of the German war, and the latter having survived by sixteen the peace of Oliva. The election of Michael had put an end to the distractions of his country, and in his pacific reign of thirty-two years the Russians found an opportunity of recovering from the dissensions, by which the nation had almost been exhausted[51]. In the commencement of it he had been compelled to purchase peace of the Swedes by a cession of the territory adjacent to the Baltic, as if to give occasion to the reaction, which animated the efforts of Peter. Of the tranquillity, which he had thus obtained, he availed himself for erecting fortresses[52], inviting foreign officers into his service, and forming his army according to the model of the other nations of Europe. Alexis is described as having lifted a corner of that veil of ignorance[53], which his son Peter endeavoured to tear at once from the eyes of his subjects. In the midst of domestic troubles he gave to his subjects a code of laws[54], which is still in part retained; for their instruction he caused many treatises on the arts and sciences to be translated into the language of Russia[55]; and to animate their industry he established in various provinces of his empire manufactures of linen, of silk, and of iron, and laboured to form a fleet on the Caspian Sea, and to open an intercourse with China. The agitations of his reign, which was not equally tranquil

[51] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome ii. p. 137. [52] Ibid., tome iii. pp. 22, 26, 31. [53] Ibid., p. 108. [54] Ibid., p. 45. [55] Ibid., pp. 103, 106.

with that of Michael, were favourable to the prosperity of his country. The domestic troubles[56], by which it was disturbed, served partly to evaporate the secret discontents of the people, as the first insurrection subsided almost spontaneously, partly to establish more firmly the authority of the sovereign, as the second was suppressed by force; and a war with Poland, for which a revolt of the Cossacks afforded a convenient occasion[57], terminated in the recovery of territory which had been ceded to that country as the price of peace. The government of Alexis was at the same time systematically managed, so as to augment the power of the crown. To subdue the turbulent spirit generally prevalent among his subjects[58], he established the secret chancery, a sort of political inquisition, which kept every rank in awe; and to disable the great nobles for acquiring a dangerous authority in the provinces[59], he obliged them to reside constantly in Moscow, and there attend upon his court.

On this great empire Sweden was, after the next reign, to make a deep impression. For this function that government had been prepared partly by the restraint, in which it had been originally held by Denmark, partly by the contentions, in which it was afterwards involved with Poland and the German empire; and it was committed with Russia for a future struggle, first by the acquisition of the provinces of that country communicating with the Baltic, and afterwards by that of Livonia, which seems to have been interposed as the debatable territory of the northern states. That the impression might be more beneficial to Russia, Sweden had received from Denmark, not only the first excitement of its military energies, but also some portion of refinement, derived to the neighbouring government from its communication with Ger-

[56] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome iii. pp. 36—66. [57] The revolted Cossacks having in the year 1654 placed themselves under the protection of Russia, it was agreed in the year 1667 that Russia should retain all the country of those tribes, which lay beyond the Dnieper, that those on the nearer side of that river should be subject to Poland, and that those named Zaporogues, who lived near its mouth, should belong to both governments, and be ready to serve against the Turks, when required. Smolensko, Nowgorod-Sewerskoi, Tschernigow, and Kiovia were at the same time recovered.—Tableau des Revol. de l'Europe, tome ii. pp. 261, 262. [58] Levesque, tome iv. p. 100. [59] Ibid., p. 110.

many. When the efforts of Sweden were to be directed against Russia, it seems to have been necessary that Denmark should be held in restraint. This was accordingly effected by the German acquisitions of Sweden, and especially by the connexion formed with Holstein, which, as that duchy was within the peninsula of Jutland, served to control all the operations of the adjacent kingdom. The agency of Sweden upon Russia having been exercised in the invasion of Charles XII., the disastrous issue of the enterprise, while it terminated the ascendency of Sweden, which had then no longer an object, deprived that country of Livonia and of a great part of its German possessions; and at length the exchange of Holstein for the counties of Oldenburg and Delmenhorst, effected in the year 1750, withdrew from Denmark the control, to which it had been subjected. Brandenburg in the interval had grown into the kingdom of Prussia, to supply the place of Sweden in its relation to the southern system.

CHAPTER IX.

Of the history of the Dutch republic, from the union of Utrecht in the year 1579, *to the advancement of the stadtholder to the throne of England in the year* 1689.

Union of Utrecht in the year 1579—Synod of Dort, 1618.—Independence acknowledged, 1648—The triple alliance, 1668—Invasion of Louis XIV., 1672—The peace of Nimeguen, 1678—The stadtholder king of England, 1689—Erasmus—Grotius—The telescope invented —Dutch school of painting.

THE Dutch republic, perhaps more than any other state of Europe, deserves the consideration of those, who would analyse the combinations of modern history. Almost entirely destitute of natural resources, it has been formed by the circumstances of other countries, and has been sustained by means altogether artificial. So dependent has this state been on external means for subsistence, that a Dutch statesman informed Sir William Temple[1], that all the corn pro-

[1] Temple's Works, vol. i. p. 46.

duced in the considerable province of Holland, would not feed the men employed in repairing the dykes. So exposed was it to hostile aggression, that its security consisted only in the desperate expedient of inundating those fields, which with so much labour had been rescued and preserved from the sea. With no other native commodities than butter and cheese and earthenware, and without one commodious harbour for shipping, it established a system of commercial prosperity, such as the world had never witnessed, and wrested from Spain and Portugal the dominion of the east.

A very principal particular in the topography of the territory is represented by all the historians of the Netherlands, as formed in no distant period by a natural cause as if to prepare the scene of its commercial greatness. The Zuyder-zee[2], at the inmost recess of which Amsterdam, its principal city, is situated, they describe as having been created, perhaps so late as the year 1421, by an irruption of the Northern Ocean, opening itself a passage into a small inland lake, which already existed. The maritime communication, which was thus happily supplied, superadded a facility of naval traffic to the inland communications already furnished by the Rhine and the Meuse, and qualified it to be the site of a government dependent on commerce for subsistence.

As a natural cause prepared the territory, so two political combinations of distant states, the one in the north, the other in the south of Europe, were instrumental to the commercial greatness of the Dutch republic. The union of Calmar, which combined under a single government the three kingdoms commanding the entrance of the Baltic, exercised an important influence in reducing the ascendency of the hanseatic confederacy, just when the Dutch were beginning to aspire to commercial importance. The union of Portugal with Spain on the other hand, begun fifty-six years after that of the northern countries had been finally dissolved, exposed to the enterprising activity of the Dutch, the eastern possessions of the former, which the latter was unable to protect.

The actual formation of the republic was the result of the

[2] Anderson, vol. i. p. 247. Lyell however, from Alting, refers the event to the year 1282, but adds that the breach was afterwards widened. Principles of Geology, vol. ii. p. 57. Lond. 1835.

connexion of the Netherlands with the Spanish monarchy, as it acted upon the spirit of independence, which the reformation of religion had generated in them. That connexion brought upon the inhabitants, who had been long accustomed to a mild government, the oppression of a gloomy and bigoted despot, while the zeal of a purer religion animated them to dare every extremity of suffering in defence of their civil and religious rights.

That a new government of this description should have been at that particular time sent forth, as a new organ of the incipient system of Europe, is one of the most interesting particulars in modern history. The federal history of Europe has been described as divisible into two periods, in the former of which Austria was the predominant and France the balancing government, in the latter France acquired the ascendency, and Britain was the counterpoise. In the transition from the former to the latter it is easy to conceive, that France may have gradually risen over Germany, to hold the ascendency in its place; but it is not equally obvious to understand how the British government, which had been much estranged from the concerns of the continent, should succeed to the secondary station, and maintain the balance of Europe. The peculiar function of the Dutch government appears to have been, to introduce the insular government of Great Britain into this connexion with the political interests of the continental states. This function it discharged by entering into federal relations, which were indispensable to its own existence, and then involving Great Britain in those arrangements, by sending its stadtholder to be the leader of a revolution in these countries. The expedition of William of Normandy, more than six centuries before, had engaged England in a relation of rivalry with France; and the enterprise of the Dutch William had at this time the operation of engaging the same government in an extended and complicated system of continental policy, so that its ancient rivalry of France might become the means of supporting the equilibrium and the independence of Europe.

While the continental arrangements of Germany and France were in progress towards their adjustment at the treaty of Westphalia, this new government was formed, to

be instrumental to the subsequent change of the system; and that treaty, by which those earlier arrangements were completed, and also the epoch of the acknowledged independence of the new government, by the agency of which the transition to others more perfect was to be effected within the half of a century. The double process had its origin in the double connexion of the Spanish monarchy with Germany and with the Netherlands. Spain with all its resources being, in the time of the emperor Charles V., connected with the German empire, the Austrian dominions, and the Netherlands, alarmed France into exertions, which began the earlier arrangements; and the same monarchy, in the time of his son Philip II., being still connected with the Netherlands, provoked the defection of the Dutch provinces, and gave being to the organ, by which these were converted into others more comprehensive. It may perhaps not inaptly be compared to the twofold organization by which the embryo is nourished in the womb of the mother, and at the same time another provision is made for its future support, when it should have entered upon a new and more perfect existence.

The Dutch republic is commonly considered as having commenced its existence in the year 1579, when seven provinces, Guelderland, Holland, Zealand, Utrecht, Overyssel, Friesland, and Groningen, without expressly renouncing their allegiance to the crown of Spain, assumed to themselves the exercise of the sovereign authority. The sixty-nine years, which intervened between that event and the peace of Westphalia, was the period of its progress to maturity, at the end of which it took its place among the acknowledged governments of Europe.

The seven united provinces are computed to extend but one hundred and fifty British miles from the north of Groningen to the southern boundary, and but one hundred from the North Sea to the circle of Westphalia[3]. Of these provinces Holland[4], Zealand, Friesland, and Groningen, which were adjacent to the sea, formed the real strength of the republic, the others, with the conquered towns in Brabant, Flanders, and the duchy of Cleves, being but frontier-districts, which served to protect the former. Among the

[3] Pinkerton's Mod. Geog. vol. i. p. 467. [4] Temple, vol. i. p. 43.

maritime provinces Holland was of principal importance, raising in the general assessments[5] much more than the half of the sum levied upon the whole confederacy. As the republic was in truth a confederacy of seven distinct communities, in which even the several cities, fifty-six in number, retained many rights of sovereignty, the preponderating importance of that considerable province was essential to the maintenance of the combination of the government.

The union of the confederacy could not however have been originally formed without the operation of a long series of external hostilities, forcing into combination the several communities, which had little natural coherence. The union, concluded at Utrecht in the year 1579, was followed by a struggle with Spain, which continued thirty years, and the renewal of hostilities, after a truce of twelve years, rendered the republic a party in the great German war of thirty years, from which it disengaged itself only by a treaty concluded with Spain in the same year with the general peace of Westphalia. The interval of external peace was occupied by the ecclesiastical contention of the republic, Harmine, or Arminius, having in the year 1604 proposed his doctrine in opposition to that of Calvin, and the synod of Dort having been convened in the year 1618 for determining the controversy.

Nor would even this protracted agency of external violence have been sufficient for giving consistency to the confederacy, if the government had not during five years been conducted by William prince of Orange, who possessed all the qualifications required in a situation of so much difficulty. Tutored in his youth by the emperor Charles V., this prince had been early formed to the practice of political address; he was so moderate in his conduct that, in an age of religious violence, he acted with toleration towards Protestants, while he was a Roman Catholic, and towards Roman Catholics, when he had embraced the reformation; and, incapable of being either elated or depressed by events, he maintained in all embarrassing conjunctures an undisturbed serenity of soul, which enabled him to guide his country through the perils of her first efforts of indepen-

[5] According to a table, given by Sir W. Temple, Holland raised 58,309 guilders out of every sum of 100,000.—Ibid., p. 37.

dence. This great prince was in the year 1584 assassinated in consequence of a proscription, published against him by Philip II. The United Provinces were then however regularly engaged in a war with Spain, and the prince was succeeded in the public confidence by his son Maurice, whose military genius[6], which was of the very first order, qualified him better for continuing the struggle, which amidst its earlier difficulties had been best sustained by the wisdom and the patience of the father.

As the adoption of the reformation was essentially necessary for connecting the Dutch republic with the British government in a struggle, in which the mutual opposition of Roman Catholics and Protestants was the main principle of the contention, so had the division of the two primary sects of the Protestants a principal influence in developing the political parties of the state, and the synod of Dort was accordingly a great crisis of its domestic agitations. The persecutions of Charles V.[7], had driven many of the reformed from Germany into the Netherlands, especially into Holland and Brabant, where the privileges of the cities were considerable, and the government of the emperor was less severe, as in the country of his birth. The impulse of religious reformation having been received from Germany, it was in the year 1566 resolved that the Lutheran profession should be publicly adopted, though with indulgence to those who entertained different opinions. Many causes however cooperated to transfer the ascendency to the doctrine of Calvin. The persecution in France drove great numbers of French Calvinists into the Netherlands; the great intercourse with England, the church of which was of an intermediate character, gave additional credit to their opinions; the Calvinists of Germany lay nearest, and most ready to afford their assistance; the profession of this form of the religion of Protestants was most adverse to the hated religion of Spain; its ecclesiastical administration accorded best with the republican form of the government, and left to the state the temporal possessions of the former church; and Holland in particular, which had never admitted the clerical order among the states, was most inclined to a profession of faith,

[6] Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. ii. pp. 172, 273. [7] Temple, vol. i. pp. 56—58.

which gave to it no jurisdiction. By the union of Utrecht it was accordingly determined, that each province should regulate its own religious concerns; and in the year 1583, only four years afterwards, it was ordained by a general agreement, that the doctrine of Calvin should be adopted as the religion of the state.

The Arminian party at length arose, and, as it became involved with the political struggle of the government, gave occasion to violent agitations. Arminius, professor of theology in the university of Leyden, proposed in the year 1604 a modification of the doctrine of predestination, which had in the fourth century been held by Ambrose[8], teaching that the decrees of God, by which he determined the future condition of every individual, were not absolute and irrespective, but formed in reference to that foreknowledge, by which the conduct of each individual was foreseen, yet not controlled. The republic began about five years afterwards to be agitated with this controversy, and during nine years was violently disturbed; until at length, in the year 1618, the doctrine of Arminius was formally condemned by the synod of Dort.

No distinct notion of the doctrine of predestination had been opposed to that of Calvin, before Arminius revived the exposition of Ambrose. The synod, by which this doctrine was condemned, was composed of sixty-four national deputies[9], and of twenty-eight persons delegated by the churches of England[10], of the Palatinate, of Hesse, Swisserland, Geneva, Nassau, East-Friesland, and Bremen. The foreign deputies were not permitted to interpose by their votes in the determination of the schism, which distracted the republic; but they were permitted to communicate their opinions, and to sanction the proceedings by their presence.

The cause of the Arminians was in effect decided[11], before it was examined, as that of the Protestants had been prejudged in the council of Trent. Two deputies only appeared on their part; and, though these might, without the

[8] Mosheim, vol. ii. p. 93. [9] Abrégé de l'Hist. de la Hollande, par Kerroux, tome ii. pp. 500, 501, note. [10] The king of England, in his desire to support the prince of Orange, caused his deputies to favour the Calvinists, though with moderation, instructing them not to oppose the doctrine of universal redemption.—Heylyn's Hist. of the Five Articles, p. 76. Lond. 1660. [11] Kerroux, tome ii. pp. 500, 501, note.

possibility of inconvenience, have been permitted to vote in the assembly, yet were they, before any decision had been made, ordered by the president to renounce the character of members of the synod, and to associate themselves with thirteen other Arminian ministers, who had been cited to appear as persons accused. The persons thus subjected to trial by a synod, assembled to decide a question of theology, were all finally condemned, and by the sentence of the synod were deprived of their ecclesiastical benefices, and banished from the territory of the republic. The result was however very different from that of the council of the church of Rome. By the determinations of the council of Trent the religion of Rome was not only reduced to a more systematic form, but was also thereby rendered more fixed and permanent in its character. Of the synod[12] it has been on the contrary remarked, that the doctrine, which it condemned, began from that very time to prevail among Protestants, and in no distant period became predominant over that, which it had so solemnly maintained. The difference must be ascribed to the independent spirit of the religion of Protestants, which refers all doctrines to the Bible, as the sole authorised standard, and must therefore be susceptible of some variation, according to the changes of opinion concerning the right interpretation of the sacred scriptures.

The political dissension, with which this religious schism became connected, had manifested itself so early as in the year 1590[13], and was indeed the natural struggle of the opposite powers of the local magistracies and of that presiding authority, which the war of the revolution had vested in the family of Orange. The two parties contended on the question of continuing or concluding the war with Spain; and in the year 1607[14], while prince Maurice was at the head of the party desirous of prosecuting hostilities, Barnevelt, the pensionary of Holland[15], was the chief of the opposite party. The ministers of religion, in their hostility to Spain, were generally attached to the prince, who reci-

[12] Mosheim, vol. v. pp. 368, 369, 389. [13] Kerroux, tome ii. p. 525. [14] Ibid., p. 429. [15] The pensionary, so named because he received a salary or pension, was an assessor joined in each province to the deputies of the towns for directing the transaction of business. The pensionary of Holland was named the grand pensionary.

procally was desirous of securing the support of so powerful a body. The ministers being mostly Calvinists, their adversaries the Arminians acquired the favour and protection of the provincial states, the adversaries of the prince. The struggle was brought to a crisis while the synod of Dort was assembled, Barnevelt, the celebrated Grotius, and two other leaders of the opposition-party, being arrested by the order of the states general. Barnevelt was soon afterwards condemned and executed under some very vague imputations of treasonable misconduct[16]. Grotius and one of the two others were sentenced to perpetual imprisonment with the confiscation of their properties. The remaining leader anticipated the proceedings of the tribunal by a voluntary death. Grotius and his companion in suffering having been committed to the castle of Louvestein, whither many other prisoners of state were afterwards sent, the opposition-party received from their adversaries the name of the Louvestein faction. Thus were originally developed the parties, which Sir William Temple[17] predicted would be the cause of the ruin of the state, more than a century before the prediction was accomplished in the war of the French revolution. Escaping from confinement in the following year, Grotius sought refuge in France.

The territory of the republic, though ill furnished with internal resources, was eminently favourable to commercial prosperity. It was convenient to a fishery, which at once fed the inhabitants, and supplied them with a valuable object of traffic; and, being central between the northern and the southern countries of Europe, and communicating by great rivers with the interior of the continent, it facilitated the operations of traders. In circumstances so commodious for commerce, the people were by the narrow and unproductive soil of the country compelled to seek in their industry the means of their support, and by its exposure to the inroads

[16] In one instance he acknowledged conduct, for which he cannot be acquitted. He admitted that he had received from the court of France a present of 20,000 florins, alleging only that it had been given in consideration of services already performed, and not with the design of influencing in subsequent actions!—Kerroux, tome ii. pp. 432, 433. [17] Temple's Works, vol. i. p. 28.

of the ocean were excited to an unremitting vigilance for the preservation even of their existence.

But, however the circumstances of the Dutch republic may have fitted it for forming an extensive commerce, they were not favourable to the permanence of its prosperity. The want of domestic resources rendered it dependent on a fishery, in which it was exposed to competition, and on a carrying trade, which must decline in the same proportion, in which other maritime nations became attentive to commerce. It appears also[18] that the colonies, which might have supplied the deficiency of domestic resources, were not prosperous, the jealous restrictions, imposed by a mercantile administration, having rendered a residence in them ineligible for persons of property and character. The result was that the prosperity of the republic was confined within the limits of a single century, and served chiefly as a temporary agency to excite the activity of the British government.

The Dutch republic had been assisted both by France and by Britain in its struggle for independence. Its connexion however with these allies was dissolved by the separate treaty, which it concluded with Spain, instead of adhering to the enemies of the house of Austria, and waiting to be comprehended in the general peace, which terminated the great war of Germany. This dissolution of its early connexions was notwithstanding accommodated to its actual situation, and but an anticipation of a change of policy, which must soon have arisen from the altered relations of the state. Spain was at this time so enfeebled, and France soon became so formidable a neighbour, that the remaining dependencies[19] of the former in the Netherlands were rather to be considered as constituting a barrier of

[18] De Witt's True Interest and Political Maxims of the Republic of Holland, pp. 123, &c.

[19] The Spanish Netherlands, which had been ceded by Philip II. to his daughter Isabella in the year 1598, returned to the crown of Spain by the death of that princess in the year 1635. They had however not been wholly detached from that crown, for, though the sovereignty had been transferred to Isabella on her marriage with the archduke Albert, yet she and her successors were required to swear fidelity to the kings of Spain, and a right was retained of placing Spanish garrisons in some principal places, so that these provinces were, even in the life of Isabella, a fief of Spain.—Watson's Hist. Philip III., p. 9.

protection against the power of the latter, than as an object of jealous apprehension. With the British government on the other hand a natural rivalry of commerce existed, which unavoidably tended to involve the two states in contention. The foreign policy of the republic was accordingly opposed to both France and England, the one its formidable neighbour on the land, the other its powerful rival on the sea; and the mode, in which this double opposition of policy operated to place the stadtholder of the republic on the British throne, is a subject of curious speculation.

The same religious commotions, which gave independence to the Dutch provinces, also drove into England multitudes of the industrious inhabitants of the Netherlands, who multiplied and enlarged its manufactures; and the fishery of Newfoundland, in which England was engaged[20] even before the Dutch republic existed, furnished an object of extensive traffic with the countries of the Mediterranean. These causes co-operated with the natural advantages of a large and productive country, to render England in the seventeenth century a powerful competitor of the Dutch republic for the commerce of the world.

The spirit of commercial rivalry manifested itself early in the seventeenth century, the divided state of the trade of the East Indies bringing the two maritime powers into collision, on which occasion, in the year 1609[21], Grotius maintained the pretensions of his countrymen in a treatise concerning the right of the commerce of India. The fisheries of herrings on the coasts of Great Britain and Ireland, furnishing another subject of contention, occasioned a controversy between the same distinguished writer and the English Selden, concerning the dominion of the adjacent seas. These however were only the dark and threatening indications of a yet distant tempest. James I., though sufficiently disposed to resist the encroachments of the Dutch, found himself necessitated by a war with Spain to submit to an atrocious massacre of his subjects in the island of Amboyna; and the troubles, which agitated the reign of Charles I., disabled that monarch for vindicating by arms the dominion of the seas, which bordered his own shores. The storm at length burst

[20] Anderson ad an. 1578. [21] Bayle's Dict., art. *Grotius*.

upon the Dutch republic from the energetic administration of the English commonwealth.

Disappointed in the project of effecting an incorporating union of the two governments, which would have engaged the United Provinces in the contest with the family of the Stuarts, the parliament of England passed the famous act of navigation, which struck a fatal blow at the carrying trade of the Dutch. A furious war soon afterwards broke out between the two countries, and the Dutch were at length reduced to the necessity of acquiescing in the restriction imposed by the act. The operation of this humiliation on their government was important and decisive. The succession of the princes of Orange in the government had been interrupted in the year 1650, when William II. died, leaving neither issue nor brother. His princess indeed was soon afterwards delivered of a son, the same who subsequently became king of these countries; but the party adverse to the power of a stadtholder prevailed in this crisis, and the republic remained without a chief. The war with Cromwell, which commenced about two years afterwards, and was disastrous and disgraceful to the Dutch[22], procured, more than any other cause, numerous partisans to the family of Orange, the people becoming every day more sensible of the necessity of their guidance; and, though Cromwell, perceiving this effect of his hostilities, was induced to conclude a peace, in which he endeavoured to stipulate for the exclusion of the young prince from the dignity long possessed by his family, it was yet the remote cause of his elevation, which was at length effected in the year 1672, when the office had been suspended during twenty-two years[23].

The impression made by the war of Cromwell was strengthened by another, which in the year 1664 was commenced against the republic by Charles II. The jealousy of commerce had rendered the people of England desirous of the contest, and the king may have hoped that, by subduing the adverse party, which at that time ruled the republic, he might reinstate his nephew[24], the young prince of Orange, in the dignity of his family, and bring the republic into a depend-

[22] Kerroux, tome ii. p. 664. [23] Ibid., tome iii. pp. 872, 873.

[24] The mother of the young prince was Mary, daughter of Charles I., and sister of Charles II. and James II.

ence on the British government. Though the adverse party was not then deprived of power, the calamities of the struggle must have rendered the Dutch more sensible of the importance of having a chief, to direct the efforts of the republic against her enemies.

While the operations of the British government tended to effect the re-establishment of the family of Orange, those of France not only tended to the same end, but also served to involve that family in the combinations, which gave occasion to the revolution of the British government, and thereby engaged these countries in the same relations with the continental states.

Philip IV. of Spain having died in the year 1665, Louis XIV. claimed a large portion of the Spanish Netherlands in the right of his queen[25], the daughter of that prince, disregarding a renunciation contained in her marriage-settlement, and confirmed by the treaty of the Pyrenees. The French king in the year 1667 asserted his claim by arms with distinguished success, and the Dutch, alarmed at his progress, concluded in the following year a triple alliance with England and Sweden for the protection of those provinces[26]. The alliance drew upon the Dutch republic the vengeance of Louis, who began his operations with detaching England and Sweden from the confederacy, and then invaded the territory of the republic with a force, which none of the cities ventured to withstand. The Dutch in their consternation offered conditions of peace, which might have satisfied the ambition of the king, for they proposed to relinquish to him all the territory belonging in common to the[27] United

[25] The pretension embraced the duchy of Brabant, the lordship of Malines, Antwerp, the high Guelderland, Namur, Limburg, with its dependencies beyond the Meuse, Hainault, Artois, Cambrais, the county of Burgundy, the duchy of Luxemburg, and a principal part of the county of Flanders.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. p. 187.

[26] In this treaty occurred the first instance of a mediation, obtruded by the negotiating powers on two contending parties. The three governments engaged to dispose France to an armistice, and to persuade, or compel Spain, to accept one of two plans of accommodation; and by a secret article Great Britain and the Dutch republic were bound to assist Spain against France, if the latter should refuse to accept peace on such conditions.—Ibid., pp. 189, 190. This is a remarkable illustration of the influence of the balancing system.

[27] This comprehended parts of Flanders, Brabant, high Guelderland, I imburg, and

Provinces, and to pay a large sum of money for defraying the expenses of the war. Fortunately however for the general interests of Europe, as well as for the particular independence of the United Provinces, he was induced to reject a proposal[28], which would have rendered it easy for him to control all the measures of the republic.

Driven to the resolution of despair, the republicans were at length successful in repelling a force, by which they had been invaded from the sea. A new confederacy was then formed against France by the emperor, the king of Spain, various princes of Germany, and the king of Denmark. The result was the peace concluded at Nimeguen in the year 1678, by which France restored to the republic the only part of the territory of the latter[29], which it still possessed. Of the extreme danger, from which the advancement and the policy of the young prince of Orange delivered his country, we may best form a conception from the strong language of the historian, who says that[30], if the republic was not then annihilated the cause was, that such events depend not on the will of the powerful of the earth, and that there is above them a power, which sports with their projects, and at its own pleasure sets bounds to their vengeance, as to their ambition.

Though this struggle terminated in restoring the territory of the republic, it had exercised an important influence on the government, by giving immediate occasion to the re-establishment of the family of Orange, with even augmented dignity. The party adverse to that family had prevailed

the bishopric of Liege. These districts having been acquired after the union of the seven provinces, their inhabitants were considered merely as subjects, and were not admitted to any public offices.—Révol. des Prov. Unies, tome i. p. 207. Nimegue, 1788.

[28] The secretary of state advised that this proposal should be accepted, but M. de Louvois, the minister of war, annexed to it conditions, which the republic could not but reject. Among other things it was required, that an ambassador should be sent annually to the king, to present a medal bearing an inscription, which should purport, that the Dutch held from him their liberty.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. pp. 201, 202.

[29] But, though the Dutch conquests of France were thus restored, that country derived considerable advantage from the treaty, Spain having ceded all Franche Comté, together with many cities of the Spanish Netherlands.—Ibid., p. 211.

[30] Kerroux, tome iii. p. 790, note.

from the year 1650, and in the year 1667 had been possessed of influence sufficient to procure the enactment of the *perpetual edict*, by which it was for ever excluded from the government. The public distress however, which had been aggravated by the neglect of the military defences of the country, when there was no longer a military chief, caused such a change of the public opinion in favour of the deposed family, that in the year 1672 the young prince of Orange was invested with the dignities[31], which it had formerly enjoyed. Two years afterwards considerable advantages were conferred upon the prince, as if to compensate for the long continued degradation of his family; the states of Holland determined that his dignities should be hereditary to his male descendants, and grants of money were furnished for assisting to maintain his rank.

The triple alliance, caused by the pretension of Louis XIV. to the Spanish Netherlands, was the primary arrangement of those combinations, by which the equilibrium of the political system was established in the later period of the federative policy of Europe, as by that measure Great Britain became connected with the Dutch republic in resisting the ambition of France. The prince of Orange having been four years afterwards placed at the head of the republic, that marriage with his cousin, the daughter of James II., on account of which he was afterwards placed upon the throne of these countries, was concluded after another interval of four years, and in the year preceding the peace of Nimeguen. His party was desirous that he should have an heir, to profit of the new arrangement by which his dignities had been rendered hereditary. This wish was frustrated, for the marriage produced no offspring; but the union, however destitute of natural, was fruitful of political consequences, as it became the connecting bond of the new system of federative policy.

As the ambition of the emperor of Germany had been the exciting principle in the earlier, so was the ambition of the French monarch the exciting principle in the later arrangements of Europe. Scarcely had the peace of Nimeguen[32] re-established tranquillity, when Louis XIV. by new en-

[31] Kerroux, tome iii. pp. 799, 872, 873.

[32] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. pp. 221, &c.

croachments gave occasion to new troubles. Having established chambers in the parliaments of Mentz and Besançon, and in the council of Alsace, for examining the nature and extent of the cessions, made to France by the several treaties of Westphalia, of the Pyrenees, and of Nimeguen, he procured by the determinations of these chambers, which were named the *chambers of re-unions*, so many cities and lordships, that in a time of profound peace he made acquisitions more considerable, than he could have hoped from the most successful war. The result of these proceedings was a general league formed against France by the continental states, begun by Sweden and the Dutch republic in the year 1681. This combination however was too weak to act, except by negotiating, for Spain was exhausted, the states of the empire were disunited, and the emperor was embarrassed by a revolt of the Hungarians, and by an invasion of the Turks, who even besieged him in his capital. The ambition of the king soon gave a new impulse[33], by invading the empire in the year 1688. Various reasons were assigned for this unprovoked aggression, but a secret motive[34] was the hope of diverting the prince of Orange from the expedition to England, which he was then preparing. That prince had however the sagacity to perceive, that his own existence and that of his country required, that the power of the British government should be brought into the combinations of his policy; and the measure of the French government, by which it was hoped that he might be hindered from prosecuting his enterprise, served but to urge him to make the attempt, to give him a pretence for the armament, by which it was achieved, and to send in a different direction the hostile force, by which it might have been frustrated.

Sir William Temple[35] has spoken of the Dutch as a people

[33] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. pp. 221, &c. [34] The duke de St. Simon has assigned, as the true origin of this great war, a dispute between the king and his minister Louvois, about a window in a small building named the Trianon. The minister, who had the superintendence of the buildings, was offended at the remarks of his master, and is said to have on that account determined to occupy his thoughts with a war, which he accordingly excited a few months afterwards.—Memoires, tome i. p. 22. Marseilles, 1788. The story brings to mind a story of a similar measure, suggested by Alcibiades to Pericles, for diverting the attention of the Athenians. [35] Temple's Works, vol. i. pp. 50, 54.

actuated by good sense, rather than by genius, and has declared that he had never seen any young man among them, who was heartily in love, nor any young woman, who seemed to care, whether she was the object of such an attachment. Schlegel[36] has however spoken with much commendation of the poetry of Holland in the time of Grotius, and has described it as abounding in vernacular tragedies composed after the ancient model, a considerable time before the great tragic writers of France were fostered in the court of Louis XIV. Holland, he says, was at that time the most learned and enlightened of all protestant states. The excitement of struggles both political and religious, acting upon a people so furnished with learning, might naturally be expected to draw forth the energies of genius, however they might be generally suppressed beneath the sober manners belonging to commercial industry.

In the fine arts[37] the republic, in common with Flanders, had the credit of possessing a school of painting, which, though not equal to that of Italy, has yet received the praise of genius, and in portrait-painting has taken the foremost rank. The great artists of this school were Rubens, Vandyke, and Rembrandt. The first of these was born at Cologne, but resided at Antwerp, where he died in the year 1640. Vandyke, the scholar of Rubens, was born at Antwerp in the year 1599, and died in London in the year following that of the death of his master. Rembrandt was born near Leyden in the year 1606, and fixed his residence in Amsterdam, where he died in the year 1647. The defect of this school is the want of a poetical conception of character; but in the same proportion, in which it was devoted to the faithful representation of individual objects, was it qualified to excel in painting portraits, a part of the art which, however abused by vanity, must ever be esteemed as preserving a memorial of genius, as alleviating the sorrows of absence, and as affording a melancholy gratification to mourning affection. In this part of the art Vandyke was almost wholly employed; Rubens was most distinguished for his combinations of colours, and Rembrandt for his striking disposition of light and shade.

[36] Lect. on the Hist. of Litt., vol. ii. p. 257. [37] The Flemish, Dutch, and German Schools of Painting, by the Rev. J. T. James, pp. 151—201. Lond. 1822.

The literary glory of the Dutch republic is due chiefly to two individuals, Erasmus and Grotius, the former of whom may be considered as the Lucian[38] of modern times, the latter was the public legislator of nations, producing the first code of those laws, by which in improved society the intercourse of nations should be regulated. It belonged indeed peculiarly to this people to produce the first code of international law, their own political existence being a result of the very combinations, which were just then, in the German war of thirty years, generating the first orderly system of international policy. The code seems as if it had been at that time prepared for the preservation of the system, which was arranged twenty-three years afterwards by the treaty of Westphalia.

Before the time of Grotius[39] the civil law of the Romans was the only code, by which lawyers affected to determine the questions of international transactions. That system of law however, having been framed for the regulation of the Roman empire, was not properly applicable to the case of independent communities. At length even this imperfect system was renounced by Hobbes, who, a short time before the treatise of Grotius appeared, had published one in which he maintained, that the natural condition of mankind is a state of war, and that every independent commonwealth has a right to do what it may choose to other commonwealths. It was then full time that some eminent man should arise to be the legislator of independent communities.

Grotius possessed all the qualities required for the performance of this great task; and the civil contentions of his country, in which he was deeply engaged, appear to have both suggested to him the necessity of devising some code of general regulation, and by imprisonment and exile to have provided him with leisure for the execution of his plan. His great work, published in France in the year 1625, is accordingly the result of all the knowledge of general morals, which could be collected from the writings of the philosophers, the poets, and the orators of antiquity, together

[38] In his Colloquies and his Praise of Folly he severely ridiculed the monks, as Lucian in his Dialogues ridiculed the false pretenders to philosophy. [39] Ward's Enquiry into the Foundation and Hist. of the Law of Nations in Europe, vol. ii. ch. xviii.

with the two grand codes of the civil and canon laws, and the dictates of divine inspiration. Success at no long interval crowned his efforts, for after the lapse of about sixty years it was universally established as the European law of nations.

In composing this treatise, that he might engage the attention of statesmen, Grotius had entered at once on the practical part of his subject, instead of beginning with those general considerations, on which it was founded. This defect was remedied by Puffendorf, who published a systematic treatise in the year 1672. This other treatise was however considered as exposed to a contrary objection, for, as Grotius was thought to have confined the law of nations too much to actual conventions, so Puffendorf was regarded as identifying it too closely with the law of nature, affirming that it was indeed only the same law, applied to states instead of individuals. A third treatise was accordingly in the year 1773 published by Vattel, who has shunned the opposite errors of his predecessors. The works of Grotius and Puffendorf notwithstanding still retain their importance, for the light and elegant treatise of Vattel requires to be aided by the more ponderous information, contained in the volumes of those early writers.

Physical science is indebted to the Dutch republic only for the casual invention of the telescope, which occurred at Middleburg soon after the commencement of the seventeenth century. When[40] Galileo heard of the invention, he constructed the instrument with which he made his valuable observations.

[40] Here (at Vienna, in the year 1609) he learned from common rumour, that a Dutchman had presented to prince Maurice of Nassau an optical instrument, which possessed the singular property of causing distant objects to appear nearer the observer. This Dutchman was Hans, or John, Lipperskey, who, as has been clearly proved by the late professor Moll of Utrecht, was in the possession of a telescope made by himself so early as the 2nd of October, 1608. Life of Galileo by Sir David Brewster, in his Martyrs of Science, pp. 23—27. Lond. 1841.

CHAPTER X.

Of the history of England from the accession of Henry VIII. in the year 1509 *to that of Mary in the year* 1553.

Henry VIII. king, in the year 1509—The supremacy of the pope rejected, 1534—The reformation begun, and the lesser monasteries dissolved, 1536—The dissolution of the monasteries completed, 1539—Edward VI. king, 1547—The liturgy prepared, 1548—The liturgy revised, and the articles of religion prepared, 1552.

The period of the histories of these countries now to be considered, beginning with the reign of Henry VIII., and ending with the revolution of the year 1688, comprehends the rise and establishment of the reformation of religion, together with its influence in preparing that equipoise of political parties, by which at the conclusion of this period the principles of constitutional freedom were finally established and secured. The processes of the reformation may be considered as extended through a series of four reigns, being completed in that of Elizabeth; but this series may be conveniently divided into two parts, the former of which, including the reigns of Henry and his son Edward, was exclusively employed in forming the system of the established church, and the latter, including those of Mary and Elizabeth, was, in regard to ecclesiastical affairs, concerned chiefly in disposing the causes, which gave existence to the important body of protestant dissenters. The present chapter will review the earlier part of the series.

It is not easy to conceive two characters more strongly contrasted than those of Henry VIII. and his father. Henry VII. was cool, circumspect, and persevering; his successor violent and impetuous, driven forward by his affections and passions, and changing his conduct as these variously impelled him: the former was fond of money even to avarice; the latter, splendid and prodigal, dissipated in a short time, not only the accumulations of his father's economy, but also the rich spoils of the monasteries[1], by the dissolution of

[1] The clear yearly value of all the suppressed houses was then stated

which he vainly proposed to preclude for ever the necessity of soliciting supplies from the people. In one respect only did they agree; both were alike arbitrary in their principles of government, and the house of Tudor accordingly carried the authority of the crown to its greatest elevation. The overbearing violence however and ostentatious extravagance of Henry VIII. were not less accommodated to the safe guidance of the English government through the first struggles of the reformation, than the profound policy and systematic economy of his predecessor had been fitted to establish the royal power on the ruins of the feudal aristocracy, while that power, so established and transmitted to him, enabled him to dictate to his people in the most important of all their concerns.

The peculiar circumstances of the English reformation, which determined its character, were that the people had been prepared for such a change a considerable time before, and yet that the immediate impulse, with all the earlier dispositions, originated from the crown. If the people had not been previously prepared, the revolution of religion, if then effected, would have been a measure merely of arbitrary power. If that previous preparation had been sufficient to generate the revolution without the authoritative interference of the crown, the reformation of England would, as in Scotland, have been extreme in principle, and democratical in its ecclesiastical arrangements. Arising, as it actually did, immediately from the will of the sovereign, but among a people well prepared for its reception, it was temperate in its origin, and accepted with an enlightened and willing acquiescence.

The seeds of the English reformation had been sown a century and a half before this period by Wicliffe, the leader of the English separatists from the church of Rome, and indeed also in some measure the author of the reformation of the continent of Europe, his writings having given occasion to the secession of John Huss, the reformer of Bohemia. The followers of Wicliffe however had been much reduced in importance before the reign of Henry VIII. They

to be £131,607 6*s.* 4*d.*; but was really ten times greater. The value of the moveables, which was very great, was not included.—Burnet's Hist. of the Reformation, vol. i. p. 257. Lond. 1715.

had been so long and so cruelly persecuted[2], that their number had been much diminished, the persecution having been continued even to the last year of the preceding reign. The civil distractions too, by which England had been convulsed in the interval, must have contributed to divert the minds of the people from speculative subjects, and to indispose them to engage in new contentions. The disciples of Wicliffe also, perhaps influenced by the example of their master, appear not to have been generally desirous of the crown of martyrdom, so that they did not much solicit the attention of the public. The people were therefore just so far prepared for separating from the Roman see, that they might be led to it by the authority of such a monarch as Henry VIII., but by no means so far, as to begin the revolution among themselves, and to force it upon the government. The greater part was still attached to the doctrines of the church of Rome, though long alienated from its clergy; and in the reign of Henry the two parties were played the one against the other, and a great revolution was effected without any mischievous derangement of the public order.

Eighteen years of this reign had passed, before that question arose, which determined Henry to reject the supremacy of Rome. But in this interval preparation was very variously made for the change, which occupied the remainder, and the whole reign, comprehending thirty-eight years, will appear to have had a common tendency. The expensive magnificence of the king conciliated the affections of his subjects, and thus increased the popularity already attached to his common descent from the rival families of York and Lancaster: his blind devotedness to his favourite Wolsey, as it transferred to this minister all the power of the crown[3], raised up an idol for the interested adulation of foreign sovereigns, which induced the Roman pontiff to alienate in his favour the prerogatives of the papal see, and thus to set an example of that vicegerency, which Cromwell exercised for Henry after the separation of the English church: and,

[2] Henry's Hist. of Great Britain, vol. xii. pp. 8, 9. [3] The king even granted to him the disposal of all the bishoprics of England.—Burnet, vol. i. p. 8. At Bruges, whither he had gone as ambassador to the emperor, he was saluted by a merry fellow in these words; Salve rex regis tui, atque regni sui.—Wordsworth's Eccles. Biogr., vol. i. p. 351, note. London, 1818.

lastly, the schemes of Wolsey, for attaining to the papacy, the highest object of ecclesiastical ambition, gave to the foreign politics of Henry a determination, which in his celebrated suit for a divorce from his first queen excluded him from the indulgence of the papal court, and drove him into a separation from a see, the doctrines of which he continued to maintain.

Wolsey had recommended himself to Henry VII. by his zeal and discretion, but the death of that sovereign had intercepted his reward. In his successor the aspiring ecclesiastic found a prince of more congenial character, and he was speedily advanced to the summit of the royal favour. Splendid in his expenses, and dissipated in his habits, he gained the affections of the youthful monarch; learned himself and a friend to learning, he encouraged the studious propensities and the literary ambition of his master[4]; and indefatigable in his application to business, he took upon himself all the anxiety, which would have interrupted the pleasures, or the studies of the king. The importance of such a minister was soon perceived by foreign courts. Honours equal to those, with which Henry himself was treated, were bestowed upon the favourite; and so entire was the attachment of the sovereign, that he was gratified even at the bribes, with which the contending princes of Europe endeavoured to win his minister to their interests.

Such a man could not rest satisfied with being made an archbishop at the recommendation of his own sovereign, and a cardinal by the influence of the king of France. He accordingly aspired to the highest station of ecclesiastical ambition, and consoled himself under his repeated disappointment by engrossing within his own country all the prerogatives of the papal supremacy. In the ninth year of this reign he was appointed legate of the Roman see in England with powers[5] greater than had ever before been

[4] His father appears to have occupied him in literature, that he might remove him from the knowledge of public business.—Burnet, vol. i. p. 10. [5] His dignity of legate *a latere* was continued to him by several bulls. In one of these he received the following extraordinary powers: of making fifty counts palatine, fifty knights, fifty chaplains and fifty notaries; of legitimating bastards; and of conferring the degree of doctor in each of the faculties of divinity, law, and medicine. These were granted to fix him in the interests of the em-

granted to such an officer; and he so stretched those powers[6], that he might almost be considered as an English pope.

The existence of this example of ecclesiastical supremacy within the realm, during so many years, may fairly be regarded as furnishing Henry, attached as he was to the church of Rome, with a precedent of the power, which he afterwards arrogated to himself, while it may have deterred him from adopting the middle measure of establishing a patriarchate for England, as appears to have been contemplated for France[7]. In one remarkable instance the extraordinary power of Wolsey was exerted in a manner, which directly led to the general suppression of the monasteries, a measure indispensable to the success of the reformation. Desirous at once of encouraging letters, and of illustrating his name by the erection of new establishments of learning, the cardinal procured from the pontiff authority to suppress certain of these societies, for the purpose of founding two magnificent colleges, one at Oxford, the other at Ipswich his native town, the Roman see being, as Hume remarks, the more easily disposed to grant this permission, as it had been perceived that, for resisting the attacks of the reformers, scholars were then more necessary than monks.

In the nineteenth year of this reign arose the celebrated question, which drove the reluctant Henry into a separation from the see of Rome[8]. His marriage with the widow of his brother had been sanctioned by one of those dispensations, which had constituted a powerful engine of the papal

peror, and probably at the desire of that prince.—Henry, vol. xii. p. 144. In the year 1522 the pope, being detained in confinement by the emperor, constituted Wolsey his vicar-general, thus devolving upon him the whole power of the papacy.—Ibid., p. 27. [6] 'Among other encroachments he established a court in his own house, called York-house, for all testamentary matters, which almost annihilated both the business and emoluments of the prerogative court of the archbishop of Canterbury. Against this innovation the archbishop remonstrated again and again, in very strong, but decent and respectful terms. But to these remonstrances the haughty vicar-general paid no regard, till he received a message from the king, of whom alone he stood in awe.'—Henry, vol. xii. p. 27. [7] Turner's Mod. Hist. of England, vol. ii. p. 322, note 44. Lond., 1827. [8] Henry had in the year 1522, published his book entitled Assertio Septem Sacramentorum adversus Lutherum; neither did he ever at any time protest against the doctrine of the church of Rome.

supremacy. The controversy therefore about his divorce involved the important consideration of the claim of the papacy to a right of dispensing with a law acknowledged to be of divine authority. In this instance, as in that of the indulgences, which had provoked the resistance of Luther, the machine had been stretched too far, and recoiled against the system, which it had been employed to support. That a pontiff should have been induced to grant such a dispensation, affords, as Burnet[9] has remarked, an example of the blindness of human policy, and of the overruling providence of God. It had probably been supposed, that the succeeding princes of England would have been thereby bound to adhere to the papal authority; the actual result was that the supremacy and religion of Rome were renounced by that government.

The frugal and politic father of Henry, unwilling to restore the dowry of the Spanish princess, and anxious to secure the alliance formed with her country, had caused her, after the death of his elder son Arthur, to be affianced to the younger. He appears however to have entertained no serious intention of completing a marriage so irregular, having ordered the young prince to protest against it, so soon as he should arrive at full age, and having on his death-bed solemnly charged him to decline the performance of the engagement. The passion of the young prince frustrated this policy, and the marriage was completed notwithstanding the injunctions of his father. These injunctions had afterwards indeed an important operation in rendering Henry scrupulous about the transaction, when his passion had subsided, especially when his disappointment in regard to male offspring seemed to be a curse entailed upon the alliance. The attractions of Anne Boleyn, who had recently appeared at court, added new force to his scruple, by presenting a more desirable object: but it has lately been proved[10], that the

[9] Hist. of the Reformation, vol. i. p. 35. [10] Turner, vol. i. pp. 10, 57. This was in the year 1527. The first match contemplated by Wolsey for the king was with the duchess of Alençon, sister of Francis; the second was with Renée the sister of his queen.—Ibid., pp. 134—160. The former appears to have declined the proposal through respect for the feelings of Catherine; the marriage of the latter seems to have been opposed in the French court, because, as one of the daughters of Anne of Brittany, she was the heiress of one half of that province. In form-

scruple had been previously entertained by Henry, and that it had been suggested to him by the French ambassador, whether in conjunction with Wolsey or not is uncertain, a divorce being at the same time projected by the latter, in favour successively of two different plans of connecting the king by marriage with the royal family of France.

Luther's opposition to the church of Rome had arisen from a question connected with the essential doctrine of our religion, and therefore led to a doctrinal reformation. The reformation might afterwards be begun in England on a mere claim of power, as a doctrinal reformation was sure to succeed. The neutrality of the question, which gave occasion to the English reformation, was at the same time productive of two considerable advantages. As it immediately but transferred to the sovereign the authority, which had been exercised by the pontiff, it left to the throne the regulation of the subsequent changes, and thus insured their moderation; and, as the separation from Rome was effected independently of all tenets of religion, it left to the reformers of the English church an entire freedom in making a choice among the separatists of the continent.

To this great revolution the foreign engagements of England appear to have been rendered instrumental by the frustrated ambition of Wolsey. Disappointed of the papal throne in the year 1522 by the election of Adrian VI., the tutor of the emperor, and again in the following year by that of Clement VII., the cardinal de Medici, Wolsey, who had before paid his court to the emperor, attached himself to his great rival Francis, involving the pontiff in the struggle, and thus drew upon his sovereign and the pontiff the determined hostility of the former. The papacy, in the progress of the struggle, was completely subjugated to the emperor, especially when the constable de Bourbon, who after his defection from Francis commanded the imperial army in Italy, had been by the necessities and the rapacity of his troops driven to the violence of plundering Rome and imprisoning the pontiff. In these circumstances the pontiff was not free to accede to a measure, which would have gratified the king of England by offending the emperor.

ing these plans Wolsey appears to have been influenced by resentment against Catherine, who had reproved him for his immoral conduct, and by hatred of the emperor her nephew.

With this very pontiff indeed the interest of the French court did at length prevail, and it seemed accordingly in the year 1533 that an accommodation might be effected with England; but in this important crisis[11] the delay of an English courier induced the papal court, though the most cautious in Europe, to pronounce against Henry a precipitate sentence, which decided his conduct. In renouncing the supremacy of the see of Rome, which was done by an act of parliament passed in the following year, he burst the bond, which had retained his kingdom in subjection. The appeal, which he was forced to make to the scriptures for the justification of his conduct, was a challenge to a general freedom of religious enquiry; and all his efforts to prove his unaltered orthodoxy, supported as they were by his extraordinary authority, but served to moderate[12] the first movements of a great revolution of religion and policy, and to preserve the tranquillity of the state.

Such was the ascendency, which Henry maintained over his subjects, that he obtained from his clergy an acknowledgment of his ecclesiastical supremacy, before it was established by the parliament. The whole body was threatened with the penalties of the proceeding denominated a *præmunire*, for having submitted to the legatine authority exercised by Wolsey, and it was intimated[13], that no application for pardon would be favourably received, if the supremacy of the king were not acknowledged in the petition. In their apprehension of the severity of Henry they complied with the suggestion. The king was thus addressed as the head of the church by a body of clergy generally attached to the religion of Rome; and it remained for himself to determine, when it

[11] Burnet, vol. i. p. 131. [12] An important result of this moderating influence has indeed prevailed through all the subsequent history of the church in the practice of reading in the pulpit written sermons, which is peculiar to the church of England, or imitated from it in some congregations of protestant dissenters. Those who in the time of Henry were licensed to preach, being often accused by warm men on both sides, found it prudent to consider well what they should preach to their congregations, and to be able to prove what had been so delivered; 'in which,' adds the historian, 'if there was not that heat and fire, which the friars had showed in their declamations, so that the passions of the hearers were not so much wrought on by it, yet it has produced the greatest treasure of weighty, grave, and solid sermons, that ever the church of God had.'—Ibid., p. 303. [13] Henry, vol. xii. p. 41.

might be expedient to demand from the parliament a formal renunciation of the papal jurisdiction.

As Wolsey[14], desirous of choosing a queen for his master, had not favoured the divorce, when Anne Boleyn was the object, his disgrace and death were natural consequences of the disappointment of the king. The king was then at liberty to choose ministers more favourable to reformation. During the remainder of his reign accordingly his confidence was enjoyed by Cranmer, whom he soon advanced to the primacy of England[15]; and also during the greater part of it by Thomas Cromwell, to whom, with the title of vicegerent, he delegated the supremacy, which he had wrested from the pope. Cranmer, who appears to have been of a conscientious and disinterested[16], but a timid and yielding character, was

[14] Turner, vol. ii. pp. 254, 273.

[15] Foreseeing the difficulties and dangers of the situation, he had earnestly declined it, when offered by the king. The oath promising canonical obedience to the pope, which was customary on such an appointment, he scrupled to swear; but was at length persuaded to do so, having previously, according to the suggestion of certain canonists and casuists, made a formal protestation, that he did not intend, by swearing that oath, to restrain himself from doing what he thought to be his duty to God, to his king, and to his country.—Burnet, vol. i. pp. 123, 124.—The expedient is liable to much objection, but it was at least not the trick of a crafty ambition.

[16] In reply to the accusations urged against this prelate by Mr. C. Butler, in his Historical Memoirs of the English Catholics, vol. i. pp. 139—141. Lond., 1819, it may be remarked, 1. that it is not true that Cranmer in any considerable degree adopted the principles of Luther at all during the reign of Henry. It has on the contrary been shown by Strype, that he held the doctrine of transubstantiation with the church of Rome to the very last year of that reign, in which year he was induced by Ridley to relinquish it.—Mem. of Cranmer, ch. xviii. Ridley had been converted by reading the treatise of Bertramn, written in the middle of the ninth century, not by the Lutherans.—Wordsworth, vol. iii. p. 302. Nor is it true, 2. that Cranmer employed the subterfuge of privately protesting against his oath of canonical obedience. He had openly objected to the appointment on that very account, and the king had caused his scruple to be referred to canonists and casuists, according to whose direction he acted, making his protestation, not in a private room, but in St. Stephen's chapel at Westminster, before some doctors of the canon law, repeating it when he took the oath, and causing it to be enrolled.—Burnet, vol. i. p. 124. Wordsworth, vol. iii. p. 559. Though, 3. he had, in opposition to the express mandate of the king, argued three days against the bill of the six articles, he did not, as is alleged, continue to cohabit with his wife, but sent her away to Germany.—Strype's Memoirs of Cranmer, p. 73. Lond., 1694. Burnet,

of all men the most fitted to influence the counsels of this boisterous and opinionative prince. His learning and virtue conciliated the respect of his sovereign, while his yielding disposition shunned every occasion of offence; and the imminent danger, to which notwithstanding all his prudence he was exposed towards the end of this reign, affords a proof that more could not have been done, to draw Henry from his adherence to the doctrines of Rome. Cromwell, though he had not enjoyed, like Cranmer, the advantages of a liberal education, yet, having been trained under Wolsey to habits of business, served Henry in the management of his new supremacy, in which he exercised as much indulgence to the reformers[17], as was practicable under such a master.

The fall of Cromwell, which happened about seven years before the death of Henry, put a period to the office of vicegerency. No one desired to be placed in a situation so obnoxious and dangerous; and the Romish party, which was then in credit, was unwilling to continue an office, which was an obstacle to a reconciliation with the see of Rome. Thenceforward Cranmer remained alone to manage the head-

vol. i. p. 313. There is, 4. no authority from Burnet, as is alleged, for saying, that he extorted from Anne Boleyn a confession of a contract, which he knew not to have existed. 5. On the subject of persecution he was deeply guilty, especially in urging Edward to sentence Joan Bocher to the stake; but it is not truly stated, that he persecuted alike Catholics and Anabaptists, for in no instance does it appear that he persecuted the former; nor is it noticed, that he was active in prevailing with Henry to suspend the severities of the statute of the six articles. 6. In regard to the divorce of Anne of Cleves it is impossible to exculpate him; but on the other hand the Romish party cannot gain advantage from the concession, for the measure was, as Burnet has stated, furiously driven on by them, and the consent of Cranmer was extorted by a well-founded apprehension for his own safety.—Ibid., p. 268. And, 7. in respect to the concluding charge of ingratitude and high treason, in endeavouring to place Lady Jane Grey on the throne after the death of Edward, it is not true that he *strove* to effect this change of the succession appointed by Henry; but on the contrary he anxiously avoided all participation in the measure, and at length yielded only to the personal importunity of his sovereign, who was solicitous to secure religion from the known bigotry of Mary. May we not then retort the words of Mr. Butler; 'we are astonished at the effect of party-spirit, and the intrepidity of the writer?'

[17] Before he entered into the service of Wolsey, he had been favourably disposed towards the reformation by studying Erasmus's translation of the New Testament.—Wordsworth, vol. ii. p. 284.

strong spirit of Henry, shielded from danger by the esteem, which his learning and virtue had excited in the breast of his sovereign. Here we perceive the influence of the divided ministration of Cromwell and Cranmer. If Cranmer had united with the see of Canterbury the vicegerency exercised by Cromwell, this office would probably have continued to form a part of the English hierarchy, and thus have established a domestic papacy. The distinctness of the two offices prevented the mischief. The ruin of the vicegerent deterred all from aspiring to the situation, from which he had fallen, and for ever extinguished an office, which must have proved embarrassing and prejudicial.

In his long reign of almost thirty-eight years Henry had six wives[18], of whom two perished by the hand of the executioner, two were divorced, and one died shortly after her marriage; the last, whom he married but four years before his death, survived him. It was accordingly observed by his contemporary Francis I., that he was always marrying and unmarrying himself. Capriciously as these marriages were contracted, or dissolved, they exercised influences, which may be distinctly traced in the history of the reformation of England. The repudiation of the first queen, which was agitated during five years, gave occasion to the memorable rejection of the supremacy of Rome. Of the two who were beheaded, Anne Boleyn and Catherine Howard, the former was the zealous protectress of the reformers, as the latter was of the Romanists; and their violent deaths served in turn to restrain the eagerness of either of the two parties then contending for predominance, and that of the former in particular[19] to detach the king from a connexion with the reformers of Germany, which he thought no longer necessary to his interests. Jane Seymour, who died within a year and a half from her marriage, seems to have served only to produce a son, whose right of succession should be

[18] Catherine was married in the year 1509, and divorced in the year 1532; Anne Boleyn was then married, and beheaded in the year 1536; Jane Seymour was married in the last-mentioned year, and died in that which succeeded; Anne of Cleves was married in the year 1539, and was divorced in the year 1540; Catherine Howard was married in the year 1540, and was beheaded in the year 1542; Catherine Parr was married in the year 1543, and survived the king, who died in the year 1547. [19] Burnet, vol. iii. p. 116.

free from the objections attending the two preceding marriages of Catherine and Anne Boleyn, an event however of great importance, as that son was to be the minor-king, in whose brief reign the reformed church of England was to be constituted. The marriage of Anne of Cleves, which had been projected by Cromwell[20], as an expedient for connecting Henry with the Protestants of Germany, proved to be one of the numerous instances, in which political men have been deceived in their measures, for the disgust of the king, which soon afterwards caused the queen to be divorced, put almost an end to all intercourse with them[21], and thus secured to England the independence of its reformation. The last queen, Catherine Parr, was a friend of the reformers, and by her extraordinary discretion[22] in avoiding every occasion of offending the king, and especially in defeating the malice of her enemies, caused Henry, after all his fluctuation, to close his reign in a disposition favourable to the reformation, insomuch that he ordered a new will to be prepared[23], merely that he might exclude bishop Gardiner, the great champion of the Romanists, from the offices of executor and counsellor of his son and successor.

By the ordinance issued for the regulation of religion in the year 1536, which began the reformation of England, the friends of reformation gained important advantages, though much of the doctrine of the church of Rome was retained. The scriptures[24], together with the three creeds, were constituted the standard of doctrine, without any mention of the tradition of the church; four of the seven sacraments were omitted, penance alone being combined with baptism and the eucharist; and though it was pronounced good and charitable to pray for the dead, yet the doctrine of purgatory was declared to be uncertain, and the superstitious practices connected with it were abolished. Of the Romish system however, besides penance, auricular confession and the doctrine of transubstantiation were still maintained; the ceremonies of the church were to be continued, as having mystical significations, which might assist in elevating the minds of worshippers to their true object; the use of images

[20] Rapin, vol. i. p. 802.
[21] Burnet, vol. i. pp. 281, 348.
[22] Rapin, vol. i. p. 846.
[23] Burnet, vol. i. p. 335.
[24] Ibid., pp. 206—208.

also was allowed, though the people were to be admonished to address their worship to God; and prayers were to be addressed to saints for their mediation, though not for obtaining mercies directly from their power. At this time[25] the people of England were generally attached to the religion of Rome, and a more considerable change might have produced only public confusion.

That which was then done, was powerfully assisted by the promulgation of the scriptures in the vernacular language. Cranmer had in the same year, in which the papal supremacy was renounced, obtained permission to procure a translation; and the work[26] having been executed in the interval, the king in the year 1537 ordered that a copy should be placed in every church, to be read by all who might choose to peruse it, and two years afterwards permitted all persons to purchase copies for the use of their families. The general press too was on this occasion[27], perhaps for the first time, brought in aid of a great public measure, many treatises adverse to the see of Rome being given to the public, among which were the King's Primer published in the year 1535, and the Bishops' Book published two years afterwards.

Some further progress was made in the year 1538 by instructions sent to the bishops, enjoining them to require of their clergy, that they should warn the people against super-

[25] Burnet, p. 335. [26] The Bible, translated by William Tyndal, with the assistance of Miles Coverdale, afterwards bishop of Exeter, had been printed at Hamburg in the year 1532, and again three or four years afterwards. Before the second edition was finished, Tyndal was put to death for his religion, in Flanders in the year 1536. It being then thought prudent to use a feigned name, the book was entitled Thomas Matthew's Bible, though Tyndal before his death had furnished all except the Apocrypha, which was translated by John Rogers, put to death in the reign of Mary, who added also some marginal notes. 'In this Bible were certain prologues, and a special table collected of the common places in the Bible, and texts of scripture for proving the same; and chiefly the common places of the Lord's supper, the marriage of priests, and the mass, of which it was there said, that it was not to be found in the scripture. This Bible, giving the clergy offence, was gotten to be restrained. Some years after came forth the Bible aforesaid, wherein Cranmer had the great hand, which, as I suppose, was nothing but the former corrected, the prologues and table being left out.'—Strype's Mem. of Cranmer, pp. 58, 59. [27] Butler's Hist. Mem. of the Catholics, vol. i. p. 54.

stitious and idolatrous practices, and to cause some of the richest and most venerated shrines to be destroyed. Here however the reformation was arrested in the year 1539 by the statute of *the six articles*, which enforced[28] by the severest penalties the remaining doctrines and practices of the Romish church. The severity of this statute indeed[29] in a considerable degree defeated its own purpose, and under the administration of Cromwell it was almost suspended. After the fall of that minister, which occurred in the following year, the influence of Cranmer[30] procured by a commission from the king a declaration of the christian doctrine 'for the necessary erudition of a christian man,' which, though it restored the seven sacraments of the Roman Catholics, yet established the true principle of christian salvation[31], and defined the catholic church in its proper sense, as comprehending all assemblies of men over the whole world, who receive the faith of Christ, and become members of the catholic church by a unity of love.

As the monks were the great agents of the papacy, the suppression of the monasteries was indispensable to the successful establishment of the reformation. This important measure was rendered acceptable by the advantages promised to the nation and to individuals. Preparation had been unintentionally made, as has been already mentioned, by the permission granted to Wolsey, authorising him to dissolve a priory in Oxford[32], and as many other small religious houses

[28] The reformers however were not abandoned to the mercy of the clergy, but were to be tried by a jury.—Burnet, vol. i. p. 248.

[29] Henry, vol. xii. p. 86. [30] Burnet, vol. i. pp. 272—280.

[31] God, it is there said, is the chief cause of our justification: yet man, prevented by grace, is by his free consent and obedience a worker towards the attaining his own justification. For, though it is only procured through the merits of Christ's death, yet every one must do many things to attain a right and claim to that, which, though it was offered to all, yet was applied but to a few. Good works were said to be absolutely necessary to salvation: these however were not only outward corporal works, but inward spiritual works as the love and fear of God, patience, humility, and the like; nor were they superstitious and human inventions, nor only moral works done by the power of natural reason; but the works of charity, flowing from a pure heart, a good conscience, and faith unfeigned. The merit of good works was reconciled with the freedom of the divine mercy, by stating that al our works were done by the grace of God.—Ibid., p. 279. [32] Henry, vol. xii. p. 247.

as he should choose, that he might be enabled to endow his literary establishments. The cardinal, encouraged by the popularity of this proceeding, solicited and obtained permission [33] to suppress more monasteries for the purpose of erecting new bishoprics; the papal bull was however not issued until the year 1533, when it had been again solicited by Henry, the cardinal having died in the interval. The renunciation of the papal supremacy in the year 1534 at length gave occasion to the general suppression of the lesser monasteries, in number three hundred and seventy-six [34]; and three years afterwards the measure was completed by the suppression of all the more considerable institutions of the same kind. The execution [35] appears to have been facilitated by the statute of *the six articles*, inasmuch as it indicated, that the king was not unfriendly to the religion of Rome. The total number of monasteries dissolved [36] has been computed to amount to six hundred and forty-five, the yearly income of which, together with that of colleges, chantries, and other establishments also suppressed, composed a sum of one hundred and sixty thousand pounds, which was estimated to exceed a third part of all the ecclesiastical revenues of the kingdom. Twenty-seven mitred abbots were by this operation excluded from the house of lords, so that an important change was effected in the political constitution of the country. It was proposed to the parliament, that the lands, which had belonged to these houses, should be for ever attached to the crown, which should thus be rendered independent of any further supply, to be furnished by the people; but, fortunately for the interest of freedom, the proposal was successfully resisted by Cromwell, who suggested the expediency [37] of gaining a firm support of the measure by parcelling the abbey-lands among numerous proprietors. Six new bishoprics however were erected and endowed, of which five still exist, that of Westminster having been since judged unnecessary.

The family of Tudor raised the royal power to a height

[33] Burnet, vol. i. pp. 54, 117, 182. [34] Ibid., p. 186. [35] Ibid., p. 248. [36] Parl. Hist., vol. iii. pp. 145—172. [37] The facility, with which Mary set aside the reformation, when these lands had been secured to their new proprietors, proves the influence of this appropriation of them in effecting that measure.—Ibid., p. 327.

before unknown, and in the reign of Henry VIII. it appears to have reached its utmost exaltation. In his latter years this prince was indeed rendered almost absolute by his obsequious parliament, an act being passed in the year 1540[38], which gave to the royal proclamations the authority of law, though with a reservation in regard to the lives and rights of individuals, and another being passed three years afterwards[39], which empowered Henry to regulate at his pleasure the religious opinions of his people. Such unexampled aggrandisement was not indeed unnecessary at such a crisis; and it has accordingly been remarked that[40], in this dangerous conjunction, nothing ensured public tranquillity so much, as the decisive authority acquired by the king, and his great ascendency over all his subjects. Hume however, in his anxiety to justify by precedent the arbitrary conduct of the princes of the house of Stuart, has represented[41] the authority of this monarch as much more arbitrary, than the facts would warrant. His subjects, captivated by the splendour of his exterior qualities, and desirous of conciliating his favour to their respective parties in religion, between which he seemed to be suspended, were ready to adopt and sanction his most capricious measures. The attempt of Wolsey however to interfere personally with the commons in a debate on a money-bill was steadily resisted; a subsequent effort to levy a tax without the authority of the parliament excited so much discontent, that Henry found it prudent to declare, that he would ask nothing except as a benevolence; and in all his changes of the ecclesiastical establishment, his divorces, and his settlements of the crown, he constantly sought the sanction of the legislature. Fortunately[42] the obsequi-

[38] Parl. Hist., vol. iii. p. 152. Great exceptions had been made to the legality of the king's proceedings in the articles about religion, and other injunctions published by his authority, which were complained of as contrary to law, since by these the king had, without consent of parliament, altered some laws, and had laid taxes on his spiritual subjects. —Burnet, vol. i. p. 251. Upon this act, adds the historian, were the great changes of religion in the non-age of Edward VI. grounded.—Ibid., p. 252. [39] Burnet, vol. i. p. 192. [40] Hume, vol. iv. p. 163.

[41] In particular he asserts, and he has been followed by doctor Lingard, that Henry received tonnage and poundage several years before it was vested in him by the legislature, whereas it was granted by his first parliament.—Hallam's Constit. Hist. of England, vol. i. p. 25, note. Lond., 1829. [42] Millar's Hist. View of the English Gov. vol. ii. pp. 439—441.

ousness of the parliament precluded all temptation to exercise the dangerous prerogative, with which he was latterly invested, and thus preserved its privileges from the mischief, to which its own imprudence had exposed them It was also fortunate, that the unthinking profusion of Henry so speedily dissipated the treasures, which had been showered on him by the confiscation of the monasteries, and immediately disappointed the hope [43], which he held out to the parliament, that the crown should never again be necessitated to require a subsidy. Such a consequence, if it had even operated during any length of time, must have been fatal to the liberties of England, as it would have deprived the people of their constitutional control. The extraordinary power exercised by Henry was soon effectually restrained by the minority of Edward VI., in the very commencement of whose reign [44] it was accordingly deemed expedient to repeal a number of rigorous statutes, together with that which gave to royal proclamations the authority of law.

As the nation had been in the reign of Henry accustomed to be directed by the government in the concerns of religion, and the disorders of the commencement of a reformation had been repressed by his energetic rule, more liberty might be given for its further progress. The weakness of a minority accordingly, while it permitted the constitution to recover from the injury, which it had sustained in the preceding reign, afforded a useful indulgence to the efforts of the reformers. Edward VI. was however no ordinary minor. Though he was not able to hinder that struggle of political parties, which served to reduce within its proper limits the royal authority, he was sufficiently enlightened and serious to interest himself in the religious question of his time, and is believed to have exercised an influence in effecting the ecclesiastical arrangements, by which his brief reign has been memorably distinguished.

To Cranmer especially we look with gratitude as the father of the English reformation, for he principally conducted it from its imperfect commencement under Henry to the completion of the established church under Edward,

[43] In the very next year after the suppression of the monasteries had been completed, a subsidy of a tenth and a fifteenth was demanded and obtained.—Henry, vol. ii. p. 315. [44] Burnet, vol. ii. p. 38.

cautiously employing for this purpose the ascendency, which his learning and piety had given him over the former, and openly and directly exerting the influence, which he possessed during the more favourable reign of the latter. The young prince, with a maturity of understanding exceeding his years, was by his education strongly attached to the new opinions; and the greater part of the council appointed by the testament of his father, particularly his uncle the duke of Somerset, who was soon after the death of Henry chosen protector of the kingdom, were favourable to the views of Cranmer.

In these circumstances the archbishop was at length enabled to give form and consistency to the English church, first by a careful arrangement of its liturgy, and then by a determination of those articles of faith, in which its clergy should be required to concur. A new liturgy was accordingly prepared in the year 1548[45], and four years afterwards a revised form of it was issued, which with some slight alterations has since continued to be used[46]. In the same year with the revision of the liturgy, articles of faith, forty-two in number, were also published, which after some omissions[47] were not only the basis of the thirty-nine after-

[45] It has been satisfactorily shown by archbishop Lawrence, that Cranmer formed our offices, in most parts in which they deviate from the ancient form, and our articles generally, after the model which had been furnished by Melancthon, correcting however the Lutheran doctrine of the eucharist, and in some other instances adopting more guarded and scriptural forms of expression.—Bampton Lect. Zuingle and the Helvetic church, which he formed, held that the bread and wine in the eucharist are merely commemorative signs of the body and blood of Christ. Calvin and the church of Geneva maintained a real, though spiritual, presence of Christ in that sacrament.—Mosheim, vol. iv. pp. 374—378. The latter opinion was adopted by Cranmer for the church of England. [46] 'If we except some additional prayers and occasional forms, that have since been inserted, the difference between Edward's second book and the present consists principally in verbal or rubrical variations, most of which were made for the sake of removing ambiguities.'—Shepherd's Elucidation of the Morning and Evening Prayer, introd. [47] Seven were omitted, relating to grace, blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, the obligation of the moral law, the resurrection as not already past, the intermediate state of the soul, the millennium, and the doctrine of universal salvation. Others were at the same time divided.—Burnet, vol. ii., Records, pp. 190, &c.

wards authorised in the reign of Elizabeth[48], but almost verbally the same.

An interesting remark of Burnet on the administration of the divine providence, in regard to the general progress of the reformation, may here be introduced. In the beginning of the reign of Edward, the reformation seemed in Germany to be almost extinguished by the dissolution of the league of Smalkalde, by the capture of its protectors the elector of Saxony and the landgrave of Hesse, and by the *interim* published and enforced by Charles V. In England however it was then favoured, and an asylum was there afforded to those, who were forced to fly for their religion. Again, a year before the death of Edward, when the persecution of Mary's bigoted reign was approaching in England, the Protestants obtained in Germany, by the peace of Passau, a firm and lasting establishment, and were in their turn enabled to afford protection to the fugitives of England.

[48] These, which were generally taken from the confession of Augsburg, differ in this particular, that they contain an article on the doctrine of predestination, which was omitted from the former; but archbishop Lawrence has proved that the true meaning of that article is to maintain the scriptural doctrine generally, without pronouncing on the nature of the decrees of God, whether they are arbitrary or respective. Nor in the revision of the article in the reign of Elizabeth was there any disposition to favour the doctrine of Calvin, for these words, 'though the decrees of predestination be unknown to us, yet,' were omitted, as if to avoid, as much as possible, every thing which could lead the mind to the subject. The ambiguous interpretation of Burnet, which even inclines towards the doctrine of Calvin, seems to have been suggested by a political desire of conciliating the Whigs in the dangerous crisis of the revolution. An attempt to gratify the dissenters by an act of comprehension in the year 1689 having failed, it appears to have been judged prudent ten years afterwards, to gratify them with an ambiguous interpretation of the article, which related to the great subject of doctrinal disagreement. The author at the same time, with characteristic management, declined to attach himself to either party, but for his own sentiments referred his readers generally to the early doctrine of the Greek church. It may assist in determining the origin of the ambiguity, that the commentator has himself, in another work, informed us, that his patron William, then the supreme head of the church of England, adhered to the doctrine of absolute decrees.—Hist. of His Own Time, vol. ii. p. 179. Dubl. 1734.

CHAPTER XI.

Of the history of England, from the accession of Mary in the year 1553, *to that of James I, in the year* 1603.

Mary queen in the year 1553—married to Philip of Spain—Origin of the Puritans, 1554—Elizabeth queen, 1558—Oath of supremacy required of members of the house of commons, 1562—Separation of the Puritans begun, 1566—Bull issued against Elizabeth by Pius V. and again by Sixtus V., 1570—another issued by Gregory XIII., 1580—penal laws enacted against popery, 1585—Mary of Scotland put to death, 1587—The Spanish *armada* defeated, 1588—The first poor-law, 1601—Hooker, Spenser, Shakespeare.

NOTHING is at the first view so surprising in the history of the English government, as the facility with which the religion of the nation was shifted from the protestant belief of Edward to the popery of Mary, and then again to the protestantism of Elizabeth. It appears unaccountable that a nation, which had recently under Edward completed the arrangement of its reformed religion, should so easily have acquiesced in the accession of Mary, from whom it was natural to apprehend the utmost anxiety to re-establish the religion of Rome. The explanation is however furnished by the melancholy incident of the brief usurpation of the lady Jane Grey. The succession to the crown had been embarrassed by the two divorces[1], which, by dissolving the first and second marriage of Henry VIII., had vitiated the titles of his daughters Mary and Elizabeth; and the difficulty had been increased by the interfering provisions of two acts of parliament, and by those of the last will of Henry, which omitted all mention of the issue of his sister the queen of Scotland. Edward, in his anxiety to protect the protestant establishment from the religion of Mary, ventured amidst this confusion to annul the will of his father, and named for his successor the lady Jane Grey, the grand-daughter of a sister of Henry, who had been educated a Protestant. This lady, just before the death of Edward, had been married to a son of the duke of Northumberland, offensive to the nobles for his pride, and to the people for his cruelty. The general hatred, which her husband had provoked, drove

[1] Rapin, vol. ii. pp. 27, &c.

even the Protestants to seek protection in the succession of Mary, deceived by a promise, which she had given to the people of Suffolk, that no change should be made in the religion of the state. The reluctant and interesting usurper, who soon expiated her offence on the block, was thus the unconscious instrument of advancing a popish queen, in contradiction to the very purpose, for which she had been nominated to the succession.

Of the fifty years comprehended within this chapter little more than five belonged to Mary, the remainder constituting the brilliant and important reign of Elizabeth. The brevity of the former reign appears to have been accommodated to the influences, which it exercised upon the religion of England, in rendering the people by persecution more attached to the reformation, and in giving occasion to the introduction of another sect of reformers, from which afterwards sprang the presbyterian Protestants of the country.

As it was the fortune of the English reformation to be received by the people from the government, it may easily be conceived that a short interval of persecution might have a salutary operation in rousing the minds of men to a more lively interest in favour of the new tenets[2], and thus rendering that more generally a personal, which might else have been little more than a political religion. Accustomed as the people had been to be directed by Henry, or by the ministers of Edward, in regard to the precise extent, to which the changes in their religious practices or opinions might be carried, they could not easily have felt the sincerity of religious conviction, if they had not for a time been exposed to a persecution, which should teach them to cherish those changes as their own, instead of acquiescing in them as the measures of their government.

Every thing contributed to qualify Mary for thus endearing to the Protestants of England the reformed church which they had established. The daughter of Catherine, she was even by her birth devoted to the support of the papal pre-

[2] This was anticipated by the martyr Latimer. When this bishop and Ridley were fastened to the stake, at which they suffered death, the former said to the latter, Be of good comfort, master Ridley, and play the man; we shall this day light such a candle by God's grace in England, as I trust will never be put out.—Wordsworth's Eccles. Biogr., vol. iii. p. 420.

tensions, which had been rejected in the divorce of her mother; connected by the ties of consanguinity with the royal family of Spain, she had imbibed in her infancy every sentiment of attachment to the religion of Rome, of which that family was then the great support among the governments of Europe; and by nature extremely confined in her understanding, she was in herself peculiarly incapable of justly appreciating the tenets of contending churches, or of extending any indulgence to those, whose opinions differed from her own. To facilitate her elevation, she expressly promised to the men of Suffolk[3], that she would make no change in regard to religion; but very soon afterwards, in a declaration made in her council, she promised merely that no force should be employed in the concerns of religion, and in a proclamation she informed her subjects generally, that force should not be employed except with the authority of the parliament. By all the arts of management, influence, and even violence, a parliament was assembled, on which she could depend for support; and in the second year of her reign was begun a persecution so severe[4], that her own bishops, and even Philip of Spain, whom she had married in the interval, were ashamed of the cruelty of her measures, and endeavoured to vindicate themselves from the reproach by reciprocal accusations, the bishops ascribing the guilt to the court, and Philip recriminating on the bishops.

That the two princesses, Mary and Elizabeth, should have been permitted, amidst the struggle of contending parties,

[3] Rapin, vol. ii. pp. 30—32, 42.

[4] The number of those who were burned for religion under Mary, is two hundred and eighty-eight, according to Strype.—Nares's Mem. of Lord Burghley, vol. i. p. 768. London, 1828. Mr. Butler has remarked, that the number of those, who suffered death for their religion, as he represents, under Elizabeth, was calculated by Dodd at one hundred and ninety-one, and by doctor Milner at two hundred and four.—Hist. Mem. vol. i. pp. 177, 178. Either of these numbers is considerably less than that of those, who suffered in the time of Mary; but the important distinction of the two cases is that the severities of Elizabeth were provoked. It is admitted by Mr. Butler, that the laws adverse to the Roman Catholics were not put into particular activity during the first ten years of her reign, and that during ten more 'the gibbet was not raised, nor the fire kindled.' The bull of Pius V., which was renewed by two other pontiffs, Gregory XIII. and Sixtus V., began the system of violence, and the conduct of Elizabeth was defensive.—Ibid., pp. 192, &c.

to ascend each in her turn the throne of England, and occasion the two alterations of the religion of the state, is a remarkable and curious circumstance, especially as each was indebted even for personal safety to a principal person of the party opposed to her own. Henry, irritated by the resistance of Mary, was long disposed to strike terror into his subjects by putting her to death[5], and was withheld only by the gentle influence of Cranmer. Elizabeth on the other hand owed her safety, in the reign of her sister, to the policy of Philip[6]. That prince was probably at first induced to interpose by the desire of conciliating the affections of the English, perhaps that he might become the true, and not merely the matrimonial king, of their country, and afterwards, when he despaired of having children by the queen, by a fear of leaving the succession open to the queen of Scotland, who was to be married to the dauphin of France, and by a hope, which he vainly endeavoured to realise after the death of Mary, of effecting a matrimonial connexion with the sister of his queen. The advancement of Mary to the throne, which was much facilitated, as has been already mentioned, by the great unpopularity of the duke of Northumberland, with whom her competitor, the lady Jane Grey, had become connected, was also assisted by the divorce of the mother of Elizabeth, which involved her title in the same difficulty with that of Mary, and obliged her to maintain the validity of the will of her father, as it called her to the throne next after that princess.

As many of the English Protestants[7], as could withdraw from the persecuting fury of Mary, fled into those parts of the continent, in which the prevalence of the reformation encouraged them to hope for a friendly reception. Their

[5] Burnet, vol. ii. p. 222. [6] Ibid., p. 267. Gardiner had procured a warrant, signed by some privy-councillors, for the execution of Elizabeth; but, when the lieutenant applied to the queen to learn her pleasure, she denied all knowledge of it. As Mary however continued to place confidence in Gardiner, it would seem that she would not have been displeased with the execution, if she could have denied all participation in it, and might perhaps have sacrificed those, by whom it had been signed. Elizabeth appears to have been afterwards disposed to act in the same manner in regard to Mary of Scotland.—Rapin, vol. ii. p. 38, note. [7] Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. p. 101. Bath, 1793.

deviation however from the Lutheran doctrine of the eucharist deprived them of the protection of the Lutheran Protestants of Germany, and drove them into a connexion with the followers of Calvin. They were not indeed unanimous in embracing the tenets of that leader. At Frankfort, where they were most numerous, they were admitted to the use of the French church, on the condition of adopting the French confession of faith and form of worship; and from their acceptance of this condition, which occurred in the year 1554, has been dated the rise of the Puritans. The other exiles, who had been settled chiefly at Strasburg, adhered to the liturgy, which had been published by Cranmer in the preceding reign, strenuously resisting the invitation of their brethren at Frankfort to agree to their new regulations. When the accession of Elizabeth allowed the return of these fugitives of religion, they brought home with them the schism, by which they had been divided in the season of their distress.

While this division occurred among the exiles, some predisposition made preparation at home for the reception of the foreign doctrine. This appears to have been a result of the bigotry of Mary, for it manifested itself among those, whom she had thrown into prison, that they might answer for their faith at the peril of their lives, probably through the excitement of their unhappy circumstances. Those who were thus confined together in the prison of the King's Bench, differing in regard to the doctrine of predestination, one of them, named Bradford, prepared a statement of the doctrine of absolute decrees, which he submitted to the three leaders of the English reformation, Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, then imprisoned at Oxford[8]. Of these Ridley alone appears to have sent an answer; and though his reply is not extant, it has been sufficiently proved to have been unsatisfactory from a subsequent letter of Ridley, which also contains these remarkable words, 'in these matters I am so

[8] Authentic Documents relating to the Predest. Controversy, &c., by Dr. Lawrence, Oxford, 1819. The statement of Bradford did not maintain the doctrine of reprobation, into which question he would not enter. Doctor Lawrence has inferred from the use of the words 'in Christ,' that Bradford did not hold the *supralapsarian* opinion; but these words occur also in the Scotish, and even in the Westminster confession of faith.

fearful, that I dare not speak farther, yea almost none otherwise, than the text doth (as it were) lead me by the hand.' That the previous declaration, contained in the articles of the church, was not then considered as establishing the doctrine, is manifest from the letter, which Bradford sent with his statement, for in that letter he urged the three prelates to give their approbation as they might think good, and threatened that he would complain of them unto God in the last day, if they would not, as they might, help something in this behalf. It is a curious fact, that even in this commencement of the separation, and amidst all the horrors of the situation of the prisoners, the doctrine of an absolute predestination is represented in the opposing statement of John Trewe, as exhibiting an evil influence on the conduct of its advocates, for they are described as addicted to gaming of various kinds even in that sad extremity.

The reign of Elizabeth is the period, to which an Englishman is accustomed to look back, as the brightest and most cheering in the annals of his country. Schooled by adversity, and stored with that learning[9], which had been her resource and her consolation, this extraordinary woman preserved almost without interruption the domestic tranquillity of her kingdom during almost the half of a century, while the neighbouring countries of the continent were torn by religious contention, maintained almost alone against Spain, Austria, and France, the battle of the Protestants, and first developed those naval energies of her subjects, which have since spread the commerce of this empire over the ocean, and at the close of two centuries upheld the political balance of the world, and saved it from the curse of a universal dominion. In her character frailties and faults have doubtless been discovered. It has been perceived that she was foolishly vain of her person, and haughty and arbitrary in her communications with her parliaments; but these considerations lose their importance when we reflect

[9] One day conversing with Calignon, afterwards chancellor of Navarre, she showed him Latin translations of some of the tragedies of Sophocles and of two of the orations of Demosthenes, which she had made. She likewise permitted him to take a copy of a Greek epigram composed by herself, and asked his opinion in regard to a few passages of Lycophron, which she was then preparing to translate.—Henault's Chron. Abridgm. vol. ii. p. 25.

on the difficulties of her situation, and the splendour of her government. The ruling principle of her conduct, amidst all the arrogance of her behaviour and language, was the conciliation of public opinion[10], but without any timorous spirit of concession. While she studiously and successfully courted the general approbation of her subjects, she firmly repressed the growing faction of the Puritans. Her reign too, the period of Hooker, Spenser, and Shakespeare, has been crowned with a literary distinction[11], which cannot be paralleled in our history. So improved was our language in this interesting period, that Johnson has declared his opinion[12], that from the authors, which rose in her time, a speech might be formed adequate to all the purposes of use and elegance. To her protecting care extended to Ireland[13], then sunk in barbarism, are its people at this time indebted

[10] When she was threatened with the *armada* of Spain, she appealed to the public opinion by causing the first English newspaper, the English Mercurie, to be published, in the form of a small pamphlet.—Andrew's Contin. of Henry, vol. i. p. 145, note. Lond., 1796. The French gazette was published in the year 1631, or forty-three years afterwards.—Henault, vol. ii. p. 60. The credit of the original invention seems however to be due to Venice, the word *gazette* having been derived from the name of a small Venetian coin *gazetta*, which was the price of such a publication. In the year 1821 about eleven millions of copies of the daily newspapers of London alone were circulated.—Quart. Rev., No. 55, p. 203. [11] Hooker, in his Ecclesiastical Polity, ably defended the ecclesiastical establishment of his country against the efforts of those, who laboured to introduce in its place the discipline of the church of Geneva. Of the two great poets of this reign Spenser was the poet of chivalrous sentiments and manners, Shakespeare the bard of general and real nature. Of the language then so highly improved, we may say, in comparing it with the more terse phraseology of France, as Quintilian said of his own language, compared with that of Greece:—Non possumus esse tam graciles? simus fortiores: subtilitate vincimur? valeamus pondere: proprietatis penes illos est certior copia? vincamus ingenio. Nor have we any reason for conceding to that prosaic language the praise of superior adaptation to poetry, as the Roman critic has yielded it to the exquisitely musical speech of Greece. To the language of Italy on the contrary we may allow a superior fitness for poetical composition, but must reject from all competition its loose and ill-constructed prose. The French language appears thus to be pre-eminently that of society, the Italian that of poetry, the English the energetic expression both of the reasonings and of the imaginings of the mind. [12] Preface to the Dictionary. [13] The University of Dublin was founded by her in the year 1593.

for the blessings of a liberal education, and the very opportunity of speculating on her government, which has given being to the present work, may thus be traced directly to her provident bounty.

Though Elizabeth owed her safety in the reign of her sister chiefly to the politic protection of Philip, she was partly guarded in this critical interval by her own prudence, as it afterwards facilitated her accession to the throne. She not only abstained with caution from all the concerns of the government, devoting her whole time and attention to literature, but she even conformed to the rites of the religion of Rome, and left it doubtful whether she would ever attempt to renounce them. To this conformity she was the more easily disposed, as she was at all times attached to a splendid ceremonial in religious worship, from which she thought the reformers in the reign of her brother Edward had too far receded. This part of her character particularly disposed her to repress the first efforts of the Puritans, and thus to draw that line of demarcation between the established church and the Presbyterians, which was so important in the subsequent operations of the government. It has indeed been maintained that she was in her heart a Roman Catholic[14], induced only by the circumstances of her situation to espouse the cause of the Protestants; but the very parts of her conduct, which have given some plausibility to this opinion, may be explained by that prudence, which had marked her earlier life, and was still necessary amidst the difficulties surrounding her throne; nor can it easily be believed that the daughter of Anne Boleyn should have been really inclined to that religion, by which the marriage of her mother was proscribed, and her own birth pronounced illegitimate. The evasion[15], with which she replied to the inquiry concerning her opinion of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament of the Lord's supper, sufficiently proves, that she did not hold the doctrine of transubstantiation.

[14] Milner's Letters to a Prebendary, p. 193. Cork, 1802.

[15] Her reply is said to have been this:

Christ was the word, that spake it;
He took the bread, and brake it;
And what the word did make it,
That I believe, and take it.

It may easily be understood that the difficulties[16], which presented themselves to Elizabeth at her accession, would naturally cause some vacillation in her conduct. She had seen the religion, in which she had been educated, proscribed by Mary with little opposition, and must therefore have felt that the re-establishment of it would require much management. To her also, as a female, the resumption of the supremacy of the crown, which had been vindicated by her father, may naturally have appeared a matter of delicacy, and even of scrupulous hesitation. In these circumstances it cannot be deemed surprising, that she should, immediately after her accession, have made a conciliatory notification of that event to the Roman pontiff, though neither can it reasonably be inferred, that in this measure she could have had any further purpose, than to establish a moderated reformation in connexion with that see. Fortunately however for the reformed church of these countries, the papal see was then held by a pontiff, who rejected all conciliation, and would admit no compromise. Paul IV.[17] replied to her ambassador, that the kingdom of England was held but as a fief of his see; that she, being illegitimate, had no title to the succession; that he could not contradict the declarations of preceding pontiffs; and that she must submit herself absolutely to his free disposition. A conciliatory spirit[18] was manifested two years

[16] To the real difficulties of that crisis an imaginary one has been added by Roman Catholics, who have supposed a fatal interruption of episcopal ordination, Kitchen bishop of Llandaff having alone taken the oath of supremacy; and the objection has been twice urged within a very few years. It has however been proved, that the story of a mock consecration, celebrated on this account at the Nag's Head tavern in Cheapside, is destitute of all reasonable evidence, and that the consecration of Parker in particular to the see of Canterbury was regularly performed by four persons duly invested with the episcopal character, three of them having been bishops in the reign of Edward, though deprived of their sees by Mary, and the fourth being a suffragan bishop of Bedford. It is remarkable that no such difficulty can be at all alleged against the succession of the bishops of Ireland, nine having conformed in the reign of Elizabeth.—The validity of English Ordination Established, by Doctor Elrington. Dublin, 1818.

[17] Butler's Hist. Mem., vol. i. p. 151.

[18] Pius IV. in the year 1560 sent an eminent ecclesiastic to Elizabeth, earnestly entreating her to return to the bosom of the church, and offering

afterwards, by the succeeding pontiff Pius IV., but the opportunity had been lost by the intractable arrogance of the former, and the reformation of the English church had then been irrevocably decided.

It was not in these times contemplated, that the religion of any portion of the people could be permitted to be different from that, which was authorised by the state. Elizabeth however was not disposed to enforce with rigour the ecclesiastical ordinances of her government. When she was solicited by the emperor and some other princes[19] to grant indulgence to the Roman Catholics, and particularly to allow them to have one church in every town, she professed general kindness towards them, and intimated an intention of endeavouring to cure by connivance their refractory spirit. During ten years of her reign[20] the greater part of them continued to attend divine service in the churches of the Protestants. Though this practice was then discontinued, having been condemned by some eminent theologians of the council of Trent, a considerable degree of lenity was still observed by the government, for the clergy of their religion[21], when they addressed James at his accession to the throne of England, declared that 'the queen always professed to punish none for their religion, and that the first twelve years of her reign, as they were free from blood and persecution, so were they fraught with all kinds of worldly prosperity.'

The laws enacted in the reign of Elizabeth, which virtually excluded Roman Catholics from the house of commons, and proscribed their religion, were not framed without urgent provocations. In the year 1562, the fifth of her reign, an act of parliament was passed, which re-

to annul the sentence pronounced concerning the marriage of her mother, to ratify the liturgy by his authority, and to grant to the English the use of the sacrament under both kinds. The ecclesiastic had proceeded as far as Calais, but by a determination of the royal council was refused admission into England. The same pope afterwards urged the queen to send an ambassador to the council of Trent, and permit her prelates to attend. Her answer was, that she could not treat with any power, the authority of which the parliament had declared to be unlawful.—Butler's Hist. Mem., vol. i. pp. 152, 153. [19] Ibid., vol. iii. p. 144. [20] Ibid., p. 171. [21] Ibid., p. 189.

quired that, besides certain other classes of persons, all members of every future house of commons should swear the oath of the supremacy of the queen[22], the lords however not being subjected to that obligation, as persons of whose loyalty the queen was sufficiently assured. This law was occasioned by the practices of the agents of Rome[23], which menaced the tranquillity of the kingdom; but, though in itself severe[24], it was administered with much lenity. In the year 1585[25], a system of penal regulations was established, the purpose of which was to suppress throughout the kingdom the religion of Rome, by depriving those who professed it of all ministers for the celebration of its rites, and of all opportunity of receiving education from other countries, while it was denied to them at home. This was indeed a proceeding of extreme severity, which only the last necessity of political defence could justify, and this not as against religionists, but as against traitors. That such was the case of the English government has been amply proved. The Roman pontiff, Pius V., by a bull issued in the year 1570, declared

[22] The supremacy of Henry VIII. was unanimously acknowledged by the convocation in the year 1530 with this limitation, quantum per Christi legem licet. The limitation was understood by the one party, to confine it to temporal matters, by the other to admit the administration of those of an ecclesiastical nature, so far as it should be conformable to the gospel. The king trusted that it would in time be forgotten, as indeed it was.—Burnet, vol. iii. pp. 52, 53. About five years afterwards the supremacy was confirmed by an act of parliament without the limitation. Soon after the first session of parliament in the reign of Elizabeth the oath of supremacy was tendered to the bishops, but refused by all except Kitchen bishop of Llandaff. The queen then published injunctions, in which she declared that she claimed only a sovereignty over all manner of persons under God, so that no foreign power had any rule over them.—Ibid., vol. ii. pp. 366—369. A corresponding change was made in the articles, Edward having, in those published in his reign, been declared to be 'after Christ the supreme head on earth of the church of England and Ireland.' [23] Nares's Mem. of Lord Burghley, vol. ii. p. 290, note. Lond., 1830.

[24] To refuse a second time to take the oath was then pronounced to be treason, whereas the refusal had been treasonable only in the third instance. But, with the approbation of the queen, archbishop Parker wrote to his suffragans, directing them to be very careful how they tendered the oath a second time, and desiring that they would, before they should do so, inform him of the case.—Ibid. [25] Rapin, vol. ii. p. 120.

against Elizabeth all the hostility of the church of Rome; and for supporting this bull there was an influx of missionary priests from foreign seminaries, which had been established for their education. The bull was the more alarming, as it directed the Roman Catholics to consider it as obligatory only when a favourable opportunity might occur. In the year 1580 Gregory XIII.[26] renewed the bull of Pius V., and issued another to incite the Irish to rebellion by a promise of the same plenary indulgence, which had been offered to encourage the crusades.

The political situation of Elizabeth and her kingdom was at this time truly alarming. Her throne was menaced by a general confederacy of Roman Catholic powers, especially the pope, the emperor, and the kings of Spain and France; and Mary of Scotland, the claimant of her succession[27], presented herself as the object of the combination of these foreign powers, and of the conspiracies of the Roman Catholics of England. How far the bigotry of popery could drive men in that age, was sufficiently illustrated by the massacre of Saint Bartholomew's day, perpetrated in France in the year 1572, celebrated as it was by a papal jubilee[28]. The struggle of Elizabeth was for independence and safety, and every measure, which the defence of these interests might justify, she was free to adopt. In that struggle were involved the security and the permanence of the reformation, for England was the common protector of persecuted protestants; but to Elizabeth it presented itself as a political emergency, and her conduct claims to be judged and estimated by the general principles of justifiable policy.

The death of the unfortunate Mary of Scotland has

[26] When the *armada* was almost ready to sail against England, Sixtus V. renewed by another bull the sentence of deposition already pronounced by Pius V. and Gregory XIII. It should be observed that Pius V. was beatified in the year 1672, and canonised in the year 1712.

[27] Mary was the grand-daughter of the elder sister of Henry VIII., but had been overlooked in his disposition of the succession, Frances duchess of Suffolk, the daughter of a younger sister, being named in his will to succeed Elizabeth. The latter, by marrying after the death of the duke her master of the horse, a young commoner, had disparaged the pretension which the will had given her.

[28] Nares's Mem. of Lord Burghley, vol. ii. p. 612.

thrown a dark shade of criminality over the conduct of this otherwise brilliant sovereign. It appears that Elizabeth herself did not think her conduct in this particular wholly justifiable, for she plainly desired that the death of Mary might be effected without her concurrence. The tranquillity, however, which she maintained in her own kingdom amidst circumstances so perilous, and the ascendency which she preserved over her people to the last moment of so long a reign, sufficiently attest the worldly policy, which regulated her measures; and it may afford some palliation in another view, that there was not yet in existence any known code of law for regulating the international intercourse of states, the noble treatise of Grotius not having been published until the year 1625, thirty-eight years after the death of Mary. Concerning that queen it may here be remarked, that her long captivity, by exciting the utmost efforts of the Roman Catholics of England in her cause, threw Elizabeth more and more upon the support of her Protestant subjects; that her death [29], by opening the succession to Philip of Spain, whose tyranny was dreaded even by the former, while it stimulated his ambition to the invasion of England, procured for Elizabeth their aid in the defence of the country; and that the manner of it, as shall be particularly shown hereafter, assisted in furnishing the authority of precedent for the more formal condemnation of her unhappy grandson Charles I.

While the government was gradually detaching itself from the Roman Catholics on the one part, it was also on the other separating those Protestants, who had attached themselves to the system of Geneva, from the genuine members of the church of England, as it had been established by Cranmer, and restored by Elizabeth. From these two ecclesiastical arrangements all the succeeding movements of the government have had their origin.

The separation of the Puritans from the established church occurred in the year 1566, four years after the virtual exclusion of the Roman Catholics from the house of commons. The act of uniformity, passed in the second year of Elizabeth, gave occasion to the one, as the act of supremacy had

[29] Nares's Mem. of Lord Burghley, vol. iii. p. 282. Lond., 1831.

given occasion to the other. From the enactment of the former those, who had brought with them from Geneva other notions of ceremonial and discipline, continued to express their discontent, until at length[30], the enforcement of the act of uniformity having deprived all the ministers, who entertained such sentiments, these resolved in the year 1566 to hold separate assemblies, in which, rejecting altogether the English liturgy, they should worship agreeably to the service-book of Geneva. The Puritans however long cherished the hope of effecting such a change in the established church, as might render it conformable to their own principles; nor did they constitute a regular presbytery until the year 1572[31], when they began to despair of accomplishing their purpose.

That no plan of mutual toleration could have been adopted, is evident from the testimony of the historian of the Puritans, who has acknowledged that these were not less anxious for an act of uniformity than the other Protestants[32], without any indulgence for those, who should differ from themselves, and that the only struggle between the two parties was, whether the ritual of Edward VI. or that of Calvin, should be exclusively sanctioned by the legislature. The notion of an enlarged toleration was not suited to the spirit of the time, and misconception must be the consequence of judging of its transactions by the application of such a principle.

Fortunately for the established church the exiles, while they were on the continent, had been divided in their sentiments; and it is remarkable that those [33], who had resorted to Strasburg and some other towns for the advantage of visiting public libraries, and attending the lectures of professors, adhered to the liturgy of Edward VI. This circumstance much diminished the difficulty, by which Elizabeth was embarrassed in the formation of her establishment, for a portion of learning and improved talents was thus reserved for its support. Such was notwithstanding the scarcity of qualified ministers [34], that if this advantage had not presented itself, it might, in separating from the Roman Catholics, have been forced into an incorporation with the Puritans.

[30] Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. pp. 204, 205. Bath, 1793.
[31] Ibid., p. 236. [32] Ibid., p. 127. [33] Ibid., pp. 102, 103.
[34] Ibid., pp. 146—156, &c.

The political influence of the principles of the Puritans became even then apparent, in cherishing a spirit of freedom in the house of commons, which had however already been felt to be so important in the government[35], that about three years before the accession of Mary the sons of peers had been introduced among the representatives of the commons, and that Philip of Spain had expended large sums for securing its concurrence, the first instance on record of such corruption. The first efforts of the Puritans in the house of commons were naturally directed to the alteration of the liturgy; but in process of time the independent spirit, by which they were actuated in the concerns of religion, began to manifest itself in others merely political. In the thirteenth year of the reign of Elizabeth, this party resisted a violent act of power[36], by which one of them had been prohibited from appearing in the house of commons, because he had introduced a bill for a further reformation of the church. In this contest the queen was compelled to yield to her opponents. Shortly afterwards one of the same party made a motion against an exclusive patent, which had been granted to a company of merchants in Bristol. This proceeding engaged the house in a struggle with the queen which though the house yielded to the claims of prerogative, drew from a resolute Puritan named Peter Wentworth, a manly vindication of the privileges of parliament. Five years afterwards the same member commenced a session with a speech[37], in which he maintained the rights of the house, and complained of the infringements, by which they had been occasionally violated. For this refractory behaviour Wentworth was indeed thrown into prison; but he was after a month's confinement, without any submission, restored to his liberty, and to his place in the representation of his country.

Hume, in his anxiety to justify, or palliate, the arbitrary conduct of the princes of the house of Stuart, has gone so far as to compare the government of Elizabeth to the despotism of Turkey[38], the sovereign there possessing every power except that of imposing taxes. Professor Millar of Glasgow has however ably exposed the unfairness of the comparison[39]. It is admitted that the queen did sometimes

[35] Parl. Hist., vol. iii. p. 253. [36] Hume, vol. v. pp. 185, &c.
[37] Ibid., p. 238. [38] Ibid., p. 488. [39] Hist. View of English Govern., vol. ii. pp. 447, &c.

interfere with the freedom of discussion in the house of commons, in a manner which would now be considered as destructive of the public liberties; but this part of the constitution was then unsettled, and she so interfered only in defence of that, which she regarded as her acknowledged prerogative, perhaps considering this as only an anticipation of the negative, which she was authorised to give, when the proceedings of the commons should have been completed. The dispensing power, which in the commencement of her reign she exercised in favour of the Protestants, was very cautiously limited, being exercised only in the short interval preceding the meeting of a parliament, to which the settlement of the national religion was again submitted. The ship-money, of which she is represented to have set the precedent to the unfortunate Charles, was in her case the voluntary contribution of the naval means of the country, for resisting an alarming invasion, whereas the assessment of Charles was an audacious attempt to extort money from the people by prerogative, for the avowed purpose of enabling the sovereign to rule without the inconvenient control of a parliament. The necessity of the time invested her with extraordinary authority by the appointment of the court of high commission, for exercising her ecclesiastical jurisdiction, which appears to have been indispensable for maintaining the public tranquillity amidst the agitation of religious controversy; but neither this court, nor the star-chamber, could very generally interfere with the administration of justice in a country, in which juries were established, without exciting such an opposition, as must be sufficient for suppressing the obnoxious tribunal. If Elizabeth said to her parliaments, that she would not permit them to discuss the foreign interests of the state, neither is the legislature even now considered as possessing a direct cognizance of them, and it should be considered that the wisdom, with which they were managed by Elizabeth, secured to her the general approbation of her subjects.

The reign of Elizabeth was interposed between the decline of the feudal aristocracy and the rise of the commons; and, while the crown still retained much of its ancient pretensions of prerogative, the commons had not yet found opportunities of establishing distinct principles of freedom. In these cir-

cumstances the powers claimed by Elizabeth were doubtless, in many instances, such as would not now be tolerated. But that the paramount authority of the parliament was then acknowledged, appears from the testimony of Sir Thomas Smith, secretary both to Edward VI. and to Elizabeth [40]. Though, as will hereafter be shown, the struggles occasioned by the efforts of the Puritans, did essentially contribute to the development of the principles of freedom, it is by no means true, as the historian has stated [41], that the English owe to this sect the whole freedom of their government.

These views of the internal government of Elizabeth exhibit to us a wise and vigorous sovereign, guiding a powerful people through circumstances of the greatest difficulty and danger, almost without an interruption of the public tranquillity, conducting with caution a revolution of religion, repressing with vigilance and firmness the efforts of a discontented party, and yielding at the precise moment, when to persist would have committed her with her people. But the splendid views of this important reign are those, in which we behold Elizabeth contending with the leagued potentates

[40] 'The most high and absolute power of the realm of England consisteth in the parliament.' Then, having enumerated the various functions of the parliament, he concludes with saying, 'all that ever the people of Rome might do, either in *centuriatis comitiis*, or *tributis*, the same may be done by the parliament of England, which representeth, and hath the power of the whole realm, both the head and the body.'—Commonwealth of England, book ii. ch. ii. 'Did it ever happen,' says Lord John Russell, speaking of this comparison of Hume, 'that a Turkish house of commons prevailed on the sultan to correct the extortion of his pachas, as the English house of commons induced Elizabeth to surrender the odious monopolies? Did queen Elizabeth ever put to death the holders of those monopolies without trial, in order to seize their ill-gotten wealth? In fact the authority of the house of commons made some advances during the reign of Elizabeth. The very weight of the power that was used to crush their remonstrances, shows the strength of their resistance. The debates of the house of commons during this reign fill a volume and a half of the old parliamentary history.'—Essay on the Hist. of the Engl. Gov. and Const., pp. 43, 44. London, 1821. Lord J. Russell has also corrected a misrepresentation of Hume in regard to the imprisonment of Wentworth, by showing, from the authority quoted by the historian, that the queen did not restore the imprisoned member, but referred his enlargement to the house. —Ibid., p. 312. [41] Hist. of Engl., vol. v. p. 193.

of the continent of Europe, protecting the Protestants of other countries from the violence of their enemies, and triumphing over the unwieldy greatness of the Spanish monarchy in its confident effort of hostility. Her foreign policy was however strictly defensive, the security of her own people being her only object. She declined the offered sovereignty of the Dutch, but gave the assistance which secured their independence, because the duke of Alva had intrigued with her domestic enemies[42], and the safety of her own throne was involved in the support of the Protestants of the continent. The *armada*, so vainly named invincible, was sent to subjugate the state, which had supported the revolution of the Dutch provinces; but the consequence of its discomfiture was that the plundered colonies and insulted coasts of Spain served to nurture the naval enterprise of England. The attention of Elizabeth, long engaged by other objects, was at length forcibly attracted to Ireland, and the subjugation of the earl of Tyrone, at the very close of her reign, completed the reduction of the island, after a perpetual struggle of nearly four centuries and a half, leaving to her successor only the task of introducing into it the blessings of a regulated government.

In the forty-third year of the reign of Elizabeth was enacted the important statute, which began the system of the poor-laws of England. It has been commonly supposed that the dissolution of the monasteries had created a necessity for this legislative provision, by withdrawing funds which had been employed in works of charity; but, as sixty years had intervened, it may rather be supposed to have been occasioned by a considerable increase in the number of the people in the lower classes[43], which various causes had co-operated to produce[44]. The dissolution of the monasteries

[42] Hume, vol. v. pp. 171—206. [43] Judge Barrington on the more Anc. Statutes, pp. 535, &c. [44] From two numerations, one made in the year 1575, the other in the year 1583, it was ascertained that the number of men in England able to bear arms was then about 1,172,000, which number multiplied by 4, would prove the total population to have amounted to 4,688,000, or if multiplied by 5, to 5,860, 000. The population in the year 1377 has been estimated from the poll-tax to have amounted but to 2,253,203. The number of the people appears thus to have been doubled in the two intervening centuries.—Chalmers's Es-

may have contributed to this increase; but the number of the people must have been otherwise much augmented in the absence of all those drains, by which it is generally moderated. During almost a century the country had suffered little by war, either foreign or domestic; nor had those colonial establishments been formed, which have since received much of the redundant population of the parent-state.

It is an honourable distinction of the English government that, when thus pressed by its population, it has endeavoured to secure all its poor from the miseries of indigence. The policy of such a regulation has indeed latterly been questioned by Mr. Malthus[45], who contends that the spring of population must always be sufficiently powerful, to multiply the objects of a bounty so liberal, and thus to increase the evil which it endeavoured to remedy. A system of regulations, by which the able poor should be furnished with the means of removing themselves and their families to another region, where their labours should be required, seems to be more effectual in regard to the evil, and less burthensome to the other classes of society. The tendency of population to press upon the limit of the means of subsistence, appears to be the appointment of the divine providence for diffusing population over the world, and to point out the proper expedient for obviating the inconvenience, which it may occasion.

That the reign of Elizabeth was a period distinguished by the literary improvement of England, has been already noticed; but the creation of the English drama appears to require in this place some special consideration. The modern drama has been by later critics divided into two species; the classical, formed in imitation of that of Greece and Rome, and the romantic, which has sprung from the chivalric poetry of the middle ages of Europe. The Italian and the French drama were constructed in imitation of the classic model, and that of Spain in the spirit of the modern romances. The drama of England, as in truth created by Shakspeare[46], seems

timate of the Comparative Strength of Great Britain, pp. 12, 14, 37—39. London, 1804. [45] Essay on the Principle of Population.

[46] The first dramatic composition in the English language, after the old moralities, was, until very lately, conceived to have been the low comedy entitled Gammer Gurton's Needle, first printed in the year

to hold an intermediate station, being neither restrained within the limits of the ancient drama, nor abandoned to the wild extravagance of that of Spain. Formed for a people, in which a great variety of human character had been freely developed, it is a faithful representation of the sentiments and actions of living men[47]. The French dramatists, under the restrictions of the classic theatre, have been compelled to supply the deficiency of action by narrations of events supposed to have occurred. The artificial complication of intrigue, and the poetical dialogue of the Spanish drama, were on the other hand inconsistent with that simplicity of truth, which characterises the plays of Shakspeare. Between these two he found a place for his own genius; and in his dramas we may exercise our affections by contemplating our nature in every condition of life, neither reduced to the tameness of narration, as in the classic theatre, nor heightened by the exaggeration and artificial combination of that of romance. This distinguished writer began his career of fame under the reign of Elizabeth, for his first play is believed to have been composed in the year 1589; but he ended it in that of her successor, his last having been written, as is supposed, in the year 1614. As he grew in reputation, he became more sensible of his powers, and gave to the world his nobler productions in the reign of James.

It is natural to enquire, what was the peculiar influence of two successive female reigns in this interesting crisis of the English history. A satisfactory answer may perhaps be given to the question. The sex of the earlier of the two queens afforded occasion for the temporary connexion with

1551; the first tragedy, named Ferrex and Porrex, was composed in the year 1561.—Pref. to Hawkins's Origin of the English Drama. Mr. Collier has however, in a recent history of English Dramatic Poetry, given the priority to a comedy entitled Ralph Roister Doister, a copy of which was discovered in the year 1818.—Quart. Rev. Jan. 1830. In forming the English drama Shakspeare was followed by a crowd of writers, among whom Ben Johnson, the earliest, was born ten years after him, and Massinger, the last survivor, died twenty-four years after his death. Between these two were Beaumont and Fletcher.

[47] The praise of Shakspeare is that he has been able to do, for every variety of character and situation, that which Horace thought to be so difficult, that he dissuaded from the attempt, *communia proprie dicere*; that his characters are not abstractions, but distinguished by all the peculiarities of individual existence.

Spain, as that of Mary of Scotland gave occasion to the similar connexion of her country with France; and this connexion made preparation for that struggle with Spain, which illustrated the succeeding reign. The sex of Elizabeth on the other hand appears to have exercised a beneficial influence in reducing within proper limits the ecclesiastical supremacy of the crown. This consideration probably determined the appointment of a court of high commission[48], for the exercise of that supremacy, which had been vested in her father, but which it might seem particularly improper to bestow upon a female. It is certain that, even with this modification, her supremacy furnished a plausible objection to her adversaries, and she herself was accordingly contented to explain it so, as to limit it to an exclusive sovereignty over the persons of all her subjects. When the necessity for such an institution had ceased, the court of high commission was abolished as a grievance; but the temporary establishment of it had usefully served to separate from the crown, whatever was excessive in the original notion of the royal supremacy. The sex of Elizabeth may have also contributed to the improvement of English manners, especially as the queen was fond of splendid pageantry[49], and willing to believe herself, even in advanced age, the object of romantic attachment. Such a period of improvement must have most seasonably preceded the struggles of the Puritans, whose fanatical austerity would else have more considerably vitiated the intercourses of society.

It only remains to notice, how remarkably the very different lengths of the two reigns were accommodated to the adjustment of the English government. The reign of Mary, a period of violent action opposed to its regular progress, comprehended only five years, whereas that of Elizabeth, in which its ecclesiastical establishment was constituted, and

[48] For the establishment of this court accordingly provision was made in the act of supremacy, passed by her first parliament. Such however were the powers actually intrusted to it, that Hume has concluded his account of it with remarking, that it was a real Inquisition.—Hist. of England, vol. v. p. 279. [49] Anquetil, writing of the year 1583, has remarked that the ceremonial of the court of England was then much more pompous than that of the court of France.—L'Esprit de la Ligue, tome ii. p. 246. The great increase of comfort and luxury in England has been distinctly stated by Hollinshed.—Chron., vol. i., fol. 85.

various interests of great importance received their arrangement, was extended to forty-five. Burnet[50] has declared his persuasion, that, if the reign of Elizabeth had not been protracted, until that generation of men had died, which had complied with the orders of her predecessor in restoring popery, the reformation would not have been securely established.

CHAPTER XII.

Of the history of Scotland, from the commencement of the Scotish kingdom in the year 843, *to the accession of James VI. to the throne of England in the year* 1603.

Kenneth Mac Alpin king in the year 843—Saxon colonization, 1097—The first connexion with France, 1168—Scotland dependent on England, 1174—relinquished, 1189—Struggle with England begun, 1290—Representation of towns begun, 1326—Struggle with England concluded, 1372—Representation of barons and freeholders, 1427—English and French parties completed, 1520—Mary queen, 1542—The Reformation established, 1560—James VI. king, 1567—Mary beheaded, 1587—Presbyterianism established, 1592.

SCOTLAND, originally occupied by the Caledonians or Picts[1], became in the year 843[2] subject to Kenneth Mac Alpin, king of the Scoti, who had first emigrated from Ireland to Kintire in the year 503. Distracted by the domestic contention of its ancient inhabitants, and harassed by the depredations of the sea-kings of the north, it yielded to the ascendency, which the Irish settlers had gradually acquired

[50] Hist. of the Reform, vol. ii. p. 371.

[1] The term Caledonia has been formed from the British term *celyddon*, signifying the woody coverts, which occupied the central parts of North Britain, and was applied to the whole peninsula lying northward from the Forth. The term Picts, derived from the British term *peithi*, signifies those who were out, or exposed, and was applied to those who lived beyond the Roman wall, as distinguished from the Romanized Britons, who lived in the province of Valentia within that line.—Chalmers's Caledonia, vol. i. pp. 200—283. The name Britain is derived from Ynis-Pridain, signifying the beautiful island. The parts of Britain nearest to Gaul were called Albion, from a view of its heights.—Ibid., p. 338.

[2] Ibid., pp. 213, 274.

in that long interval, and submitted to their prince, who accordingly began the Scotish dynasty. The kingdom thus established remained long secure from the ambition of the English, and found a useful interval for effecting its internal arrangements. England during the continuance of the Saxon heptarchy was too much weakened by division, to be capable of interfering in the concerns of the neighbouring state; and, though Egbert united it under his own government sixteen years before the advancement of Kenneth Mac Alpin, yet the new monarchy of England was still disabled for enterprises of ambition by the depredations of the Danes, begun sixty years before that union. The first Norman sovereign also was too much occupied by the difficulties of his own establishment, to have leisure for attending to the affairs of Scotland. At length in the year 1097 William Rufus furnished a body of troops, which placed on the throne of his ancestors Edgar, whose mother had been the sister of the Saxon Edgar Atheling. In this long interval of two centuries and a half[3] the Strathcluyd territory of the ancient Britons was gradually colonised by the Scoti from Ireland, and in the year 975, the Scots of Galloway, who had formed a distinct government in that peninsula, acknowledging[4] some vague dependence on the crown of the other Scots. The important accession of Lothian[5] was in the year 1020 obtained from an earl of Northumberland.

The year 1097 has been marked as the epoch[6], from

[3] Chalmers's Caledonia, vol. i., p. 356. Strathcluyd was the name of the peninsula formed by the Solway, the Irish Sea, and the Clyde. The Irish commenced a settlement from the close of the eighth century, and continued to send new colonies during the ninth and tenth, while the Danes were infesting their country. From these Gaelic colonists the peninsula appears to have derived the modern name of Galloway.—Ibid., pp. 357—359. [4] Ibid., pp. 362—366.

[5] Ibid., p. 369. [6] This influence had begun to be in some degree exercised in the year 1068, when Malcolm Canmore married the sister of Edgar Atheling, who brought into Scotland her relatives and domestics. Some barons also about the same time fled thither with their dependents from the violences of the conquest of England; and the troubles of Northumberland drove many people of the northern districts of that country into North Britain, whither Malcolm too brought many captives from his incursions. But at the death of Malcolm the Saxon followers of the queen and her brother were driven away by the enmity of the Gaelic people.

which Saxon manners by the influence of the neighbouring country began to prevail in Scotland, Edgar being then placed on the Scotish throne by the assistance of England, so that the Saxon period of Scotland began thirty-one years after that of England had been concluded by the Norman conquest. To the Saxon settlers the towns of Scotland owe their origin[7]; and from the influence of English habits the whole system of the peculiar laws of Scotland has been derived. David, whose reign began in the year 1124, was educated in England under the care of his uncle Edgar Atheling[8]; his sister being married to Henry I., he from that time resided chiefly at the English court; and by his own marriage with the heiress of the earldoms of Northumberland and Huntington he obtained possession of the four northern counties of England, Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmoreland, and Durham. Thus connected with the neighbouring country by education, by habit, and by acquisition of territory, he was naturally disposed to introduce into his own, after his accession to the throne, the improvements which he had witnessed in his earlier years. He accordingly founded towns[9]; he enacted the *leges burgorum*; he munificently endowed the church for the instruction of a rude and mixed population; and he introduced many barons from England into every district of Scotland, to give support to his crown, and security to his kingdom. To this prince indeed Scotland is indebted for the commencement of its laws, not having had[10], like England, a common law, comprehending the whole country, and founded on its ancient and immemorial usages.

The period of the peaceable improvement of Scotland appears to have ended with the reign of David in the year

[7] Chalmers's Caledonia, vol. i. pp. 610, 611. [8] Henry's Hist. of Great Britain, vol. v. pp. 116—118. [9] Chalmers's Caledonia, vol. i. p. 625. [10] Ibid., p. 445. The want of a common law left in Scotland an opening for the canon and civil laws, which were successfully resisted in England. In the year 1236 the English barons declared that they would not change the laws of England for the admission of these codes. Six years afterwards the canon law was introduced into North Britain, where before the year 1269 it was formed into a regular code. In subsequent times the civil law was declared by several parliaments to be the common law of the realm.—Ibid., pp. 734, 735.

1153, from which commenced, with the minority of his grandson, who succeeded him, the agitated period of the political relations of the country with the two rival governments of England and France, terminated at length in its union with the former. The fortune of this country has been in a very remarkable degree affected by frequent minorities, the first of which occurred on this occasion. In the year 1437 began a series of seven minorities in immediate succession[11], the last of which introduced the concluding reign of the Scotish kingdom. As its external policy commenced in the weakness of one of these times of enfeebled government, so was it brought to its crisis by an unexampled number of reigns thus inauspiciously begun, extending through a period which exceeded a century and a half.

Henry II. of England, who succeeded to the crown of that country in the year following the death of David, obtained of the weakness of his successor Malcolm IV.[12], the restitution of the greater part of those territories, which the Scotish prince held within his kingdom. William, who became king of Scotland in the year 1165, having solicited in vain the recovery of the possessions, which had been thus extorted, concluded in the year 1168 the first Scotish alliance with France. In maintaining this alliance the king of Scotland made incursions into England, in one of which he happened to be taken prisoner. The Scots, to procure the deliverance of their captive king, consented in the year 1174 to surrender to Henry the independence of their country, William becoming the liege-man of the king of England. The claim of superiority thus begun, though after fifteen years relinquished for a sum of money by Richard I. at his accession[13], served as a pretext for the pretensions of Edward, and was continually revived by succeeding princes, until it was formally disclaimed by Elizabeth. In these unhappy circumstances were begun the French and English parties in the Scotish government; they were gradually matured in the troubles of succeeding times, and the year 1520[14], when the king, James V., was a child, and the country was distracted by faction, has been marked as the crisis of their complete formation.

[11] Chalmers's Caledonia, vol. i. p. 831. [12] Ibid., pp. 626–629.
[13] Ibid., p. 632. [14] Ibid., pp. 650, 839.

The great struggle with England began in the year 1297, and ended in the year 1372, having been maintained, though with some interruptions, during seventy-five years. For this struggle preparation had been made many years before, the minority of Alexander III., which commenced in the year 1258, having been distinguished as the epoch of the open contentions of domestic factions[15]. The mature age of this prince was characterised by wisdom and vigour[16], and he acquired from Norway a cession of the Hebrides and of the Isle of Man[17], which strengthened and protected his kingdom; but his death, which occurred in the year 1286, gave occasion to the long series of troubles, by which it was soon convulsed to its centre. Alexander was succeeded by his granddaughter Margaret, named the maiden of Norway, her mother, his daughter, having married the king of that country. This princess being then only three years old, and absent from Scotland, a most favourable opportunity was presented for the intrigues of a factious nobility; and Edward I. of England, who anxiously interested himself in these agitations, procured in the year 1290 the consent of the nation to a treaty of marriage between his own heir and the heiress of the Scotish crown. This first project for effecting that union of the two crowns, which was not accomplished until three hundred and thirteen years had elapsed, was speedily frustrated by the death of the princess, which occurred in the same year, as she was proceeding from Norway to Scotland. The succession was then thrown open to the competition of numerous claimants, at the head of whom were Robert Bruce and John Baliol[18]. Edward contrived to be acknowledged as lord paramount of Scotland, for the adjudication of the crown to one of these two principal competitors; and in the year 1292 pronounced his decision in favour of the latter, who in return swore fealty to the Eng-

[15] Chalmers's Caledonia, vol. i. p. 640. [16] Ibid., p. 641. [17] Ibid., p. 643. [18] These were both descendants of king David I., who died in the year 1153, Bruce being the son of the second daughter of the third son of that king, Baliol the grandson of the eldest daughter. According to the present rules of succession the right of Baliol was preferable; but these were not then established, and Bruce was nearer in descent.—Robertson, Hist. of Scotland, vol. i. p. 10. London, 1761. Ten competitors presented themselves, the others being perhaps instigated by Edward for creating embarrassment.

lish monarch for the kingdom, which he had received from his determination.

Edward having soon proved that he was resolved to be considered as the real sovereign of Scotland, Baliol was driven to form in the year 1295 a connexion with France, and to engage in hostility with England, which reduced him to resign his crown in the following year to the English monarch. In this crisis of national degradation William Wallace, the hero of Scotland, arose to vindicate her independence. Robert Bruce, the grandson of him who had been competitor with Baliol, was brought forward as the heir of the sovereignty, was accordingly placed on the throne in the year 1306, and after a contest, which still continued twenty-two years, transmitted it to his posterity. The pretensions of England were renewed four years after the termination of that contest, and Edward Baliol, the son of John, when he had obtained possession of the throne by the assistance of Edward III., again surrendered its independence to the English monarch. The contest finally subsided in the year 1372, when Edward, after a reign of glory, sunk into imbecility. The issue would probably have been different[19], if the ambition of that monarch had not engaged him in a war with France, which exhausted his power.

The result of this long struggle was manifestly the alienation of the Scotish people from a connexion with the neighbouring government, the antipathies of the two nations being thenceforward excited by the irreconcilable claims of sovereignty and independence. The sovereignty of the English crown might perhaps indeed have been established by either of the princes who engaged in the enterprise, if it had not been frustrated by mismanagement. An artful policy might have confirmed the dominion of Edward I., whereas a violent usurpation of the royal power combined all parties among the Scots in one common and successful resistance. The vigour of Edward III. again might have attained the object, if he had not permitted himself to be seduced by the visionary expectation of effecting the conquest of France.

If the influence, which the presbyterian reformation of Scotland afterwards exercised upon the constitution of England, be considered, it will probably be concluded, that an

[19] Hume, vol. ii. p. 269.

earlier union of the two crowns, than that which was actually effected, would have interfered with the peculiar action of the Scotish government upon the neighbouring kingdom. It may be conceived that, if the two kingdoms had been thus united at any time before the reign of Henry VIII. of England, the separation from the see of Rome would have been conducted nearly in the same manner in the two countries, so that the reforming spirit in Scotland would at least have been much moderated, and some co-operation and connexion would have been established between the royal authority and the reformed church. Nor would the reign of Henry, or any of the three which followed, have afforded a convenient opportunity for uniting the crowns. Either the Scotish reformation would have been more or less assimilated to that of England, or the Puritans of England, reinforced by the Presbyterians of Scotland, would have overpowered the established church of the former country, before its institutions had acquired consistency and strength sufficient for enabling it to recover from the shock. When however Elizabeth had completed the reformation of England, the intimate connexion of the two governments might occur without embarrassment. The two great parties of Protestants had been formed in the one country, and a presbyterian reformation had prepared the other for a future coalition with that party in the former, which was placed in opposition to the ecclesiastical establishment.

The government, which at the close of eight hundred and sixty years was at length incorporated with that of England, was in its general character similar to that of the neighbouring country, being an hereditary monarchy, controlled by a parliament, into which the representatives of the boroughs and of the lesser barons had been successively admitted, the former in the year 1326[20], the latter in the

[20] Chalmers's Caledonia, vol. i. pp. 744, 830. The order of admission of these two classes was however different, the representation of counties having in England preceded that of boroughs. The cause of this difference seems to have been, that in England the representatives of the lesser nobles were early summoned to parliament for maintaining the struggle between the crown and the nobility, whereas in Scotland this was a mere measure of imitative improvement, introduced by James I. after his captivity of eighteen years.—Ibid., p. 830. The

year 1427. This general similarity fitted it for being incorporated into the constitution of the neighbouring state. It was nevertheless discriminated by some peculiarities of its arrangement, which fitted it for exercising an important agency upon the neighbouring government before its incorporation, and afterwards disposed it to yield to the measure, which put an end to its separate existence.

The chief of the peculiarities having the former tendency was the inordinate power of the aristocracy, between which and the crown the equilibrium had been almost destroyed[21]. The prerogative of the king, which from the beginning of what has been named the Saxon period, or from the year 1097, had been at least as great in Scotland as in England, was at length by various causes so much reduced, that the nobles were in truth the masters of the country. In the long contest for the crown it had perhaps been somewhat lessened, but the considerable diminution of it is referred to the princes of the family of Stuart, which obtained possession of the throne in the year 1371, these princes having, by their improvident grants of regal jurisdictions, raised up their barons to dispute their constitutional authority. The unparalleled succession of minorities which began sixty-six years afterwards, completed the abasement of the crown. The parliament at the same time appears to have suffered a diminution of its importance by a practice commenced in the year 1367[22], when a committee was first, under the pretence of convenience, appointed to act with the whole power of the legislature, for the barons, seeing the functions of the parliament delegated often to a small number of its members, disregarded its ordinances. The aristocracy of Scotland therefore, in-

privilege indeed was so little valued, that, except in a few instances, no representatives of the lesser barons appeared in parliament, and it had been almost forfeited by neglect, when a new feeling was inspired by the reformation. The lesser barons then petitioned parliament for a restoration of their right, and about a hundred representatives took their seats.—M'Crie's Life of Knox, vol. i. p. 329. Edinburgh, 1818.

[21] Robertson, vol. i. p. 25.

[22] This practice is supposed to have given birth to the anomalous institution of the lords of articles in succeeding ages.—Chalmers, vol. i. p. 824. These, by directing all the proceedings of the parliament, possessed a negative before debate. Their extraordinary powers were derived from the military genius of the Scotish nobles, which rendered them impatient of business.—Robertson, vol. i. p. 82.

stead of seeking, as in England, a support in the popular part of the government against the power of the crown, was in these circumstances exalted above both. A government thus imperfectly constituted was naturally fitted for acting with a disorderly violence on the institutions of the neighbouring country, and causing a convulsive movement sufficient to shake the whole frame of society.

The clergy of Scotland on the other hand, having been much neglected by the papal see[23], as in a remote and unproductive territory, attached themselves to the crown, which they supported as well against the aristocracy of their own country, as against the pretensions of England[24]. Protected in return by the crown, they attained to so great opulence, that at the time of the reformation they paid one-half of every tax imposed upon land[25], and therefore had probably at length acquired little less than one-half of the land of the nation. James V. endeavoured to avail himself of the support of this powerful body for the entire humiliation of the nobles[26], and would perhaps have been successful, if they had not, in their alarm at the progress of the reformation in England, involved him in a war with Henry VIII., which called the nobility into action, embarrassed all his measures, and brought him to the grave through indignation and despair. The connexion of James V. with his clergy produced however an important effect, as it threw into the hands of his chief minister, the cardinal Beatoun, during the minority of his daughter the celebrated Mary, a paramount authority, which, by committing the government in a more violent struggle with the reformers, more decisively determined the independent character of the Scotish reformation, and thus prepared it for all its important influences. The abuses of the religion of Rome being at the same time carried to the utmost excess[27], as the general barbarism and ignorance of

[23] Robertson, vol. i. p. 67. Mr. Chalmers has however specified some instances of papal usurpation even in regard to that country in the thirteenth century.—Caledonia, vol. i. p. 687. [24] The bishops, in concurrence with the barons, addressed a letter to the pope, assuring him that they would not submit to Edward of England, while one of them remained. Bruce owed his final success rather to the union and firmness of the church, than to the efforts of the nobles, who were few in number.—Ibid., pp. 694, 821. [25] Robertson, vol. i. p. 142.
[26] Ibid., pp. 67—75. [27] Ibid., pp. 141—145.

the people rendered them incapable of perceiving their grossness, until the preachers of the reformation had awakened and excited some intellectual power in the public mind, the tendency of the nation then was to secede as far as possible from the church, which they had so blindly venerated, and to construct a system of worship affecting an extreme simplicity in all its ordinances.

Circumstanced as Scotland was in regard to England, it naturally entered into a political connexion with France, the rival of its formidable neighbour. Long however after its commencement[28], the efforts of France were employed rather in mediating with England for the protection of Scotland, than in engaging the latter in hostilities with the former, the first Scotish invasion of England[29], which has been recorded as instigated by the French, having occurred in the year 1346. This connexion in process of time became more intimate, until at length the ascendency of a French interest in the government of Scotland offended the independent spirit of the people, and assisted in disposing them to the more natural connexion with England, begun by the policy of Elizabeth, and completed by the succession of James VI. to her throne.

Henry VIII. of England indeed became sensible of the importance of forming a strict and intimate union with the neighbouring kingdom, to which his own was so much exposed. James IV. of Scotland had been engaged by the French king to divide the efforts of Henry, who had defeated and routed his troops; in executing this diversion the Scotish king, with a great portion of his nobles, fell in the fatal battle of Flodden, fought in the year 1513; and in the minority which followed, Henry began that practice of bribing a party among the Scotish courtiers[30], which was afterwards successfully adopted by Elizabeth. The English monarch subsequently endeavoured to attach the king himself to his interests, and for this purpose twice proposed a personal interview at York[31]. The king of Scotland however, having been dissuaded from this measure by his clergy, who dreaded

[28] Dalrymple's Annals of Scotland, vol. ii. pp. 28, 29, 39, 162, 179. Edinb., 1776. [29] Ibid., p. 213. [30] Pinkerton's History of Scotland, vol. ii. pp. 110, 111. London, 1797. [31] Henry's History of Great Britain, vol. ii. pp. 507, 508, 519, &c.

the subversion of the established religion, as the consequence of the union of the two sovereigns, Henry, indignant at his disappointment, renewed the former system of hostility. A female reign presenting afterwards a favourable opportunity for establishing a permanent connexion by a matrimonial alliance, the English monarch conceived a desire of effecting a marriage between Mary of Scotland and his son Edward. A moderate degree of policy might have succeeded in reconciling the people of that country to this measure, which, if Edward had lived to complete it, would have anticipated by the half of a century the union of the crowns; but the impetuosity of Henry disconcerted his scheme[32]. He grasped so openly at the dominion of Scotland, that the pride of the country was roused, the French party became predominant, and in the progress of hostilities, which were continued in the reign of Edward, the Scots were at last induced to offer their queen to the dauphin, and thereby to yield to France that very independence, for which they were contending with England.

The violence of Henry thus not only defeated his own plan of union, but gave occasion to the formation of such a union with France, as decided all the subsequent politics of Scotland. The government of that country, closely leagued with France during the reign of Mary, was opposed, though unsteadily, to the progress of the reformation, which, as it was managed wholly by the people, was accordingly conducted on a principle of democratic equality; and on the other hand the indignation conceived at the ascendency of the French interest in the councils of the state, caused a revulsion of the public feeling, which attached to the interest of England many more than the adherents of the new religion, who naturally looked to a protestant government for support. The reformation was in this manner thrown upon the people, and the people were at the same time rendered favourable to a connexion with England; and thus both the character of the Scotish reformation was determined, and the people were disposed to a connexion with the neighbouring state, by which that reformation, so modified, was brought to bear on its political arrangements.

Other causes co-operated to give a democratic character

[32] Robertson, vol. i. pp. 109, 123.

to the reformation of Scotland. The lateness of its establishment has been assigned as one cause of the extreme opposition to the ancient hierarchy, by which it was distinguished[33]. In the progress of the ecclesiastical revolution of the sixteenth century, as in other convulsions, the minds of men had become more vehemently adverse to the ancient system, and Calvin had at length constituted at Geneva a form of ecclesiastical government, which substituted a republican administration for the episcopacy of the Romish, and the superintendence of the Saxon church. John Knox too, the disciple of Calvin, was an agent admirably qualified for the stern office of levelling the priesthood of his country. The contrasted characters indeed of the Scotish and English reformation may be said to have been personified in the two individuals, by whom they were respectively conducted, the fierce and unconquerable Knox and the mild and conceding Cranmer. But the grand cause of the great reduction of the ecclesiastical establishment of Scotland was the exorbitant power of the aristocracy. Hostile to the clergy on account of the support, which that body had given to the royal power, and eager to possess themselves of the great property, with which it had been endowed, the nobles cordially united with the people in constituting a presbyterian system of ecclesiastical administration, and resisted every subsequent effort of the crown to provide a liberal revenue for the church.

The more ancient church of Scotland has been considered as having prepared the Scots for the reception of a presbyterian establishment[34]. Columba a native of Ireland, who landed in Iona in the year 563, founded there a society of monks distinguished by the name of Culdees, such as he had already instituted in his own country in the year 546. This society extended its influence throughout Scotland, and even throughout England as far as the Thames, though from the latter country it was speedily driven back by the influence of Rome. Comparatively pure in their doctrines[35], the Culdees opposed the errors together with the

[33] Millar's Historical View of the English Government, vol. iii. pp. 65, &c. [34] Jamieson's Hist. Account of the Ancient Culdees, p. 328. Edinb., 1811. [35] They acknowledged no other authority for religious doctrine than the testimony of the sacred scripture; they did not maintain the duty of auricular confession; they appear not to

encroachments of Rome. In their ecclesiastical constitution they were of a mixed character, not renouncing episcopacy, but subjecting their bishops to a presbyterian government, for each monastery contained a bishop, who was occasionally deputed to the neighbouring district for ecclesiastical purposes, but was controlled by the monks. The supremacy of Rome was formally acknowledged by the Scotish church in the year 1176, to avoid the pretensions of the archbishop of York, a nearer, and therefore a more formidable master. The Culdees however continued to exist generally in Scotland to the beginning of the fourteenth century, in which Wicliffe was the harbinger of the English reformation; and in two districts of Scotland, Kyle and Cunningham, in which the reformation was first embraced, great numbers of them appeared so late as in the reigns of James III. and IV., or even down to the very age of that great revolution.

The doctrines of the reformation[36] were introduced into Scotland probably before the year 1525, the books of Luther appearing to have been imported before that time; and Patrick Hamilton, who embraced the new tenets in the fol-

have held, at least in the eighth century, the doctrine of a real presence in the eucharist; they did not worship saints; and they were so far from admitting works of supererogation, that they denied all human merit.—Jamieson's Hist. Account of the Ancient Culdees, pp. 29, 203—212. They practised marriage, succeeding, at least in some places, by inheritance; and they appear to have been associated, not for the mere purpose of observing a particular rule, but that by communicating instruction they might train up others for the ministry, so that their societies were rather colleges than monasteries.—Ibid., pp. 32, 33. The name was probably derived from the Welsh *cel*, signifying a *shelter* or *hiding*, the plural of which would be *celydi*, *celydiand*, *celydion*, *celydwys*.—Ibid., p. 5. Gibbon has said that Iona, their chief station, 'diffused over the northern regions a doubtful ray of science and superstition.'—Decline and Fall, &c., vol. iii. p. 511. Their religion however appears to have been very free from superstition; nor have we on the other hand any reason for believing, that their learning was either scientific or classical. A catalogue of the books found in the Culdean priory at Lochlevin in the year 1150, when it was given up to the canons regular, has been preserved; and this library, consisting only of seventeen volumes, was exclusively ecclesiastical.—Ibid., pp. 135, 376, 377. The monks of Iona appear to have yielded to the supremacy of Rome in the year 716, and the island was ruined by the Danes in the year 801.—Ibid., pp. 290—297. [36] M'Crie, vol. i. pp. 28—31.

lowing year, and went to Luther and Melancthon for more perfect information, was for his abandonment of the religion of Rome committed to the flames in the year 1528. From this time the cause of the reformation made continual progress notwithstanding the violence of persecution, which raged during ten years from the year 1530, the truth being made known by the dissemination of the scriptures, though there were yet no public teachers of the reformed religion. John Knox[37] declared himself a Protestant in the year 1542. Five years afterwards he was taken prisoner by a French force, which had reduced the castle of St. Andrews; and after a captivity of nineteen months on board the French galleys he repaired to England[38], where Edward was then king. Soon after the accession of Mary he fled to France, and proceeding to Swisserland visited Geneva, where Calvin had then established his system of doctrine and discipline. In the year 1555, having returned from Geneva to Scotland, he effected the formal commencement of the reformation in his native country, by inducing his friends to discontinue that attendance on the worship of the church of Rome, which they had hitherto practised for their security. In the following year he again quitted Scotland, having received an invitation to be the pastor of the English congregation at Geneva; and his biographer has remarked that by returning at this time he not only preserved his own

[37] M'Crie, vol. i. pp. 169, 170. [38] Dr. M'Crie has claimed for Knox the credit of having in this visit assisted in revising the English liturgy and articles, particularly of having by his influence excluded from the former the notion of the corporeal presence of Christ in the eucharist, and guarded against the adoration of the elements; vol. i. pp. 87, 88. But for this statement he has quoted only the authority of the prolocutor in a disputation with Latimer after the accession of Mary. Knox himself, though he has mentioned these changes with much satisfaction, has not intimated that he had contributed to effect them. Burnet on the other hand has represented, as the sole reason of the slowness, with which the service of the church was freed from these corruptions, that some of the bishops and the laity generally adhered to the old superstitions; and he has mentioned Bucer alone, as consulted in regard to the proposed corrections.—Hist. of the Reformation, vol. ii. p. 147. In regard to the articles it appears only that, after they had been prepared by Cranmer and Ridley, and submitted to the king and council, they were referred to six licensed preachers, the last of whom was Knox, and that these proposed some alterations, which have not been specified.—Strype's Cranmer, p. 273.

life, but averted from his brethren the storm of persecution. He returned a second time to his country in the year 1559, when his efforts had become indispensable to the support of the reformation, the princes of Lorraine, brothers of the queen-regent of Scotland, having then formed a plan[39] for suppressing the reformed religion in both the British kingdoms, by first crushing it in Scotland, and afterwards establishing the Scotish Mary on the throne of England in the place of Elizabeth. In frustrating this vast and ruinous project Knox was serviceable as a politician, and not merely as an ecclesiastic, for he first pressed upon the court of England the importance of affording support to the Protestants of Scotland.

The reformation, which at the death of James V. had been almost suppressed in Scotland, was restored by the operation of two political events[40], the elevation of the queen-dowager to the dignity of regent, and the accession of Mary to the throne of England. The queen-dowager of Scotland, though the sister of the princes of Lorraine, had found it her interest to conciliate the Protestants, that she might be enabled to wrest the regency from the earl of Arran their persecutor, and to resist the clergy, who continued to support him after her advancement. The queen of England on the other hand, by connecting herself with Spain, the political rival of France, disposed the queen-regent to favour and protect the fugitives, who fled from her persecution. If the two queens had heartily co-operated, it seems probable that the reformation would at this time have been exterminated from Britain; but the causes, which have been specified, hindered a coalition so baneful, and the violence of the queen of England served to send preachers into Scotland, who under the connivance of the queen-regent reanimated the zeal of the Scotish Protestants.

The dissimulation of the queen-regent was not abandoned before the year 1559[41], which followed that of the accession of Elizabeth to the throne of England. The cause of the

[39] 'In the same ship, in which he (Knox) sailed, there was sent by the French court to the queen-regent a staff of state, with a great seal, on which were engraved the arms of France, Scotland, and England. This was shown to him in great secrecy.'—M'Crie. vol. i. p. 244.

[40] Ibid., pp. 169, 170. [41] Ibid., pp. 247, 248.

Protestants had then acquired a more sure protection, and the change of her conduct, which at that time occurred, served only to rouse among them a spirit of determined and united opposition, which acquired for their religion in the following year[42] the sanction of the parliament. Nor were the circumstances of the French government less admirably accommodated to the success of the Scotish reformation, than the change of the sovereign of England. At this very time[43] began in France a series of civil commotions, which long desolated that country, and forced it to accede to a treaty with England renouncing all interference; and the death of Francis II., who two years before had married the young queen of Scotland, dissolved in the same year the connexion of the two countries. As well might the exquisitely-curious contexture of the human skeleton, which is said to have once silenced the doubts of atheism, be attributed to chance, as this combination of various and independent agencies be believed to have been any other than the dispositions of the providential government of the world.

Mary, invited by the protestant nobles on the death of her husband, returned to her country in the year 1561, but after a short time engaged in a struggle with their party. Nurtured in the tenets of Rome by her French education, she was deeply adverse to the religion recently established in Scotland; accustomed to the luxurious gaiety of the court of France, she was impatient of the grave and severe manners of those, by whom it was professed; and habituated to the flattery of a gallant people, she was incapable of regulating her conduct with that circumspection, which the difficulty of her situation demanded. She seems indeed to have been specially formed for confirming the reformation of Scotland by an injudicious resistance. She was eminently beautiful; but her blandishments had no power over the stern reformer, to whom she was opposed, nor do her charms appear to have had much other operation, than that of exciting the jealousy of Elizabeth[44]. These charms how-

[42] As the sanction of the king and queen had not been given to this act of legislation, the condition of the reformation remained unsettled until the year 1592, when James was induced to assent to the establishment of the presbyterian system. [43] M'Crie, vol. i. pp. 320, 335.
[44] Robertson, vol. i. p. 260.

ever have since received an ample tribute of admiration. The admiration, with which the aged councillors of Troy beheld the beauty of Helen, even when she was bringing ruin on themselves and their country, has been considered as the strongest testimony of the influence of female attractions on the minds of men; but long after the beauty of Mary had mouldered in the tomb[45], we find grave writers strenuously maintaining her innocence in regard to the heavy accusation of plotting the murder of her husband, apparently influenced by the mere tradition of charms, of which even no certain representation has been transmitted to succeeding ages.

Though the queen had assured the council of Trent[46] and the Roman pontiff of her unalterable determination to adhere to the religion of Rome, and the pontiff in particular of her constant resolution to effect its re-establishment in Scotland, she yet found herself at her arrival[47] compelled to intrust to Protestants the whole administration. This conduct was however abandoned in the year 1565, when she determined to marry lord Darnley in opposition to the opinion of the earl of Murray, the leader of the protestant nobles, and her prime minister; and a plan[48] for extirpating the Protestants being in the following year brought from the cardinal of Lorraine, as it had been formed by the popish princes agreeably to a decree of the council of Trent, the queen resolved to proceed to extremity with the adversaries of her religion. The intended persecution[49] was

[45] The principal writers, says Dr. M'Crie, who in modern times have undertaken the defence of Mary, are Goodall, Tytler, Stuart, and Whitaker; vol. ii. p. 225. To these may be added Chalmers, who has assumed the same office in the present century. That Mary was guilty of the murder of her husband, seems to be sufficiently established by the testimony of Morton, that 'the quene was the doare thereof.'—Ibid. Mr. Tytler however, in the seventh volume of his recent history of Scotland, has maintained the contrary, relying upon a confession ascribed to Bothwell.—Quart. Rev., March, 1841. Of the influence of female beauty, Milton has imagined a yet more remarkable operation, in representing the first sight of Eve as even disarming Satan of his malice, and rendering him for the time *stupidly good*.

[46] M'Crie, vol. ii. pp. 110, 111, note. [47] Ibid., p. 57. [48] Ibid., vol. ii. pp. 141—144. [49] Ibid., pp. 145, 146. Rizzio was confidently believed to be a pensioner of the pope, instructed to overset the reformation. Certain it is, that as he came into favour, Murray lost

frustrated by the assassination of Rizzio, which was perpetrated by the king in conjunction with some of the protestant nobles, the queen having been by that event disabled for executing her design of restoring the religion of Rome. The murder of the king himself, and the subsequent marriage of the queen with the murderer Bothwell, involved her in so much disgrace, that she was in the year 1567 compelled by her subjects to resign her crown to her son, and in the following year, when she had effected her escape from captivity, was driven to seek a retreat in England, where after nineteen years she was brought to the scaffold by Elizabeth.

The deposition of Mary was succeeded by a period of thirty-six years, which was altogether favourable to the reformation. During ten years of that time the government was administered by regents, and during the remainder by the young king James VI., the general dissatisfaction, occasioned by the delegation of the royal power, having turned the eyes of the nation to the sovereign, though at that time but twelve years old. The four noblemen, who successively exercised the regency, were all of the reformed religion; and the king, who in his infancy had been by his mother intrusted to one of them, in exchange for the castle of Edinburgh, had consequently been educated in the same faith. The circumstances, in which the country was placed by the degradation of Mary, co-operated to the same result. The long minority of her son, with his expectancy of the succession of England, opened an ample field for those intrigues, which retained it in a dependence on the protestant sovereign of the neighbouring kingdom. The protracted imprisonment of the unhappy Mary assisted their influence, for the four successive regents[50] felt that during her life it was in the power of Elizabeth to overthrow their authority, and even James, who could be induced by the English queen[51] to write a letter to his mother, in which he refused to acknowledge her as queen of Scotland, and to consider his

the confidence of the queen, his sister; and that he was an adviser of the marriage with Darnley, may be easily concluded from their extreme intimacy on the return of the latter to Scotland, which went so far as to render them partners of the same bed.—Rapin, vol. ii. p. 69.

[50] Robertson, vol. ii. p. 89. [51] Ibid., p. 129.

interests as in any manner connected with hers, must have been apprehensive of her return. The operation of the execution, with which this long series of suffering was closed, may be traced in the death of the grandson of Mary, to which it furnished a precedent. To Elizabeth the life of Mary was not longer important, as in the following year she defeated the *armada*, and finally crushed the efforts of the Roman Catholic powers.

The Scotish reformer has declared[52], that he had derived no small improvement in his qualifications for the ministry from residing in England; but his religious opinions[53] and his notions of ecclesiastical discipline and government were formed chiefly in Geneva. When in the year 1560 the parliament had required the ministers of the Protestants to prepare a summary of their doctrine, a confession of faith was presented, in which the doctrine of arbitrary, or *irrespective* predestination, was distinctly stated[54]. In the government of the church as constituted at that time, when the principal towns[55] had been supplied with ministers, a certain number of superintendents was admitted, whose office was to preach, plant churches, and inspect the conduct of others employed in large districts. This however was but a temporary appointment occasioned by temporary circumstances; and in

[52] M'Crie, vol. i. p. 125. [53] Ibid., p. 197. Knox, though employed as a preacher in the English church, declined a benefice, assigning these reasons for his refusal, that no minister had power to exclude the unworthy from the sacrament, and that this was administered to the people kneeling.—Ibid., vol. i. pp. 98, 99. He afterwards declined a bishopric offered to him by Edward, but appears to have been not very steady in his objections. He is said to have alleged at the time, that the episcopal office was destitute of divine authority, and that in the English church it was exercised in a manner not consistent with the ecclesiastical canons; but he afterwards declared, that the motive of his refusal was 'assuredly the foresight of trouble to come.' Ibid., pp. 101, 112. The truth seems to be, that even then his opinions and temper were predisposed to the system, which he afterwards embraced, when he saw it realised at Geneva. [54] It is declared that 'all our salvatioun springs fra the eternall and immutabill decre of God, quha of meir grace electit us in Christ Jesus, his sone, before the foundatione of the warld was laid;' and that, 'as God the Father creatit us quhan we wer not, as his sone our Lord Jesus redemit us quhan we wer enemies to him, sa alswa the Haly Gaist dois sanctifie and regenerat us, without all respect of ony merite proceeding fra us, be it befoor or be it efter our regeneratioun.'—Ibid., p. 331. [55] Ibid., vol. ii. p. 7.

the year 1592[56] the presbyterian system was regularly established by law, the consent of James being given, though with reluctance, on account of some political difficulties, in which he was then involved. A liturgy[57] was adopted for the Scotish church from the English church of Geneva, but one which, as it did not restrict the minister to the use of the very words of the prayers, which it contained, and even directed him to pray, as the spirit of God should prompt him, tended necessarily to its own abrogation.

In the minority of James occurred an imperfect and temporary revival of the ancient episcopacy[58], not sufficient to hinder the completion of the presbyterian system, but probably serving to cherish in the mind of the king an attachment to that order, and to rouse the reformers of Scotland to a more determined opposition. This measure, which was not condemned by Knox, was the result of a scheme of some of the nobles, for appropriating to themselves the greater part of the revenues of each see, which should else have been distributed among the ministers. In the year 1581 however, when it had subsisted nine years, the order had become so obnoxious, on account of the titles of honour by which bishops

[56] Robertson, vol. ii. p. 208. [57] M'Crie, vol. i. pp. 428, 429. As a consequence of the discretionary nature of this liturgy doctor Buchanan has expressly asserted, that in the church of Scotland the holy scriptures are never read, so that no scriptural aid is afforded to the people, when the clergy desert their articles and confessions of faith, which he intimates to be at least an occasional occurrence, remarking at the same time that among the descendants of the English Puritans, from the operation of the same cause, little more than the name of religion is left, while in the midst of rational forms and evangelical articles religion has resumed its energy.—Christian Researches, pp. 122—124. The defection intimated by Buchanan appears to have commenced in the earlier part of the eighteenth century, being begun by the professor of divinity in Glasgow, whose name was Simson. He was accustomed to say that the Westminster-confession, which had been adopted by the church of Scotland, should be taken *cum grano salis*. For this he was in the year 1720 expelled by the general assembly; but his opinions seem to have notwithstanding spread rapidly through that church, for in the year 1736 a secession was made from it on account of its alleged departure from its original principles. [58] Robertson, vol. ii. pp. 38, 39, 85. It was determined in the year 1572, that the names and offices of archbishop and bishop should be continued during the king's minority, but that their spiritual jurisdictions should be subjected to the general assembly of the church.

were distinguished, and the privilege of sitting in parliament, that an act of assembly was passed, declaring it unscriptural. James notwithstanding, in the year 1597, made another effort to establish a qualified episcopacy. The unconstitutional encroachments of the clergy on the civil government[59], occasioned by their jealousy of the favour, which the king continued to manifest towards the Roman Catholics, determined him to adopt some means of abridging their jurisdiction; and for this purpose, having by experience discovered that measures of open hostility were odious and ineffectual, he had recourse to the expedient of influencing a party among the clergy themselves. By this method he prevailed with them, not only to surrender many of their former privileges, but even to permit a number of representatives to be delegated to the parliament. This last measure he hoped would at length prove the means of restoring the ancient episcopacy; but the general assembly had carefully modified it by various regulations, which deprived these representatives of all pretensions to an episcopal character, and even subjected their civil powers almost wholly to the control of the church.

In all this struggle the Scotish church was curiously contrasted to that of England. In England an episcopal reformation was followed by the introduction of a system of presbyterian worship, which generated among the people a powerful opposition to the establishment. In Scotland, on the contrary, a presbyterian reformation was succeeded by efforts to establish prelacy, which set the government in opposition to the system of the people.

The reformation, while it emancipated the human mind from a servile submission in the concerns of religion, had a natural tendency to inspire it with notions of civil independence. The abuses of popery had elicited the first indications of liberty in the struggle of the fifteenth century, which was maintained by general councils against the papal authority; the revival of classical learning, by presenting to the view of scholars a more ample knowledge of the republican governments of Greece and Rome, had furnished them with more distinct principles of free legislation; and lastly the reformation, as it taught every man to determine for himself in regard to the most important of all interests, must have

[59] Robertson, vol. ii. pp. 228, 239, 240.

disposed him at the same time to reject the tyranny, which would destroy his civil rights, especially as civil was closely connected with ecclesiastical tyranny. Scotland, where a fierce aristocracy had frequently set the power of the sovereign at defiance, afforded a fit soil for nurturing the principle of resistance. The spirit of Knox's system also, derived as it had been from the practice of a very small republic, was peculiarly adapted to suggest to every individual a sense of his own political importance, and to animate him with a desire of resisting the control of authority. By the reformation the nobles were united with the lower orders in one common cause, in which all claimed an equal interest; and thus the principle of resistance, which had actuated only a martial nobility, was extended through the whole mass of the community.

The external relations of the country with France and England nourished the principle, which was thus generated by its internal condition. The connexion formed with France, by which the ancient religion was supported, presented to the reformers an urgent motive for concerning themselves in the political interest of their country, as they were thereby exposed to foreign aggression. The expulsion of the French troops[60] was accordingly demanded with not less earnestness, than the redress of their religious grievances; and, when their remonstrances on this subject were perceived to be ineffectual[61], it was solemnly decreed, agreeably to the advice of the deputies of the whole order of the clergy, that it was lawful for subjects to resist and depose tyrannical princes. The policy of Elizabeth, however anxious she was to maintain among her own subjects the authority of the crown, contributed to cherish in the neighbouring kingdom the spirit of resistance, which afterwards reacted upon the government of England, being employed in fomenting the discontents of the people, in opposition to the influence of the agents of France, who supported the royal authority.

For the subsequent reaction upon England, Scotland was especially fitted by that presbyterian form of church-government, which had animated its civil independence, this ecclesiastical system naturally disposing the Scotish Protestants to connect themselves with the Puritans of England. From

[60] Robertson, vol. i. p. 183. [61] Ibid., pp. 203—205.

Scotland accordingly was derived the appellation, by which the advocates of popular principles of government were afterwards distinguished in the contentions of English parties, the name of Whig having been originally a term of derision applied to the western inhabitants of Scotland[62], among whom principally the presbyterian reformation of that country prevailed. As if the queen of England was desirous of exhibiting to these original Whigs an example of the utmost extremity, to which their principle of resistance could be carried, she with the formality of a public trial brought her sister-queen to a scaffold, and thus presented to them a distant prototype of the execution of the grandson of that princess.

The crisis of the menaced invasion of the *armada* gave birth to that national covenant[63], which was afterwards extended to England, and became there the grand engine, by which the government was subverted. In the insecurity of an unsettled government, associations for mutual support had been usual among the Scotish nobles[64], and in the year 1556, when the friends of the reformed doctrine had recently separated from the church of Rome[65], they entered into a solemn agreement of a religious character, by which they bound themselves to renounce popery, and to promote, as opportunity might permit, the pure preaching of the gospel. In the association of the year 1588 the two sorts of engagements were united, for it was political, as it was opposed to a foreign enemy, and it was religious, as it was adverse to the establishment of the religion of Rome. When the enormous power of Spain threatened England with a formidable invasion, James, though eagerly solicited to form an alliance with the enemy of Elizabeth, was steady in refusing to separate himself from her cause. The zeal of the people on this occasion concurred with the personal views and interest of the monarch, and all orders agreed in framing a solemn bond of religious and political union, which comprehended

[62] The term is derived from *whiggam*, a sound used by the waggoners of the western counties of Scotland in driving their horses, whence they were themselves named *whiggamors*, and more briefly whigs.—Johnson's Dict. According to others it originally signified whey, the customary food of the peasants of the same districts.—Laing's Hist. of Scotland, vol. i. p. 366. [63] Robertson, vol. ii. p. 192. [64] Ibid., vol. i. p. 30. [65] M'Crie, vol. i. p. 181.

a confession of the protestant faith, a detailed renunciation of the errors of popery, and a declaration of the most unalterable fidelity to the association. In England also an association was formed for the support of the government of the queen; but the habits of the Scots gave to theirs a more gloomy and determined character, as they disposed them soon afterwards to form against the throne an association similar to that, which they at this time formed for its defence. It is curious to remark the different operation of the same exciting cause, the fear of the same enemy, as it diversely affected the two countries according to their respective circumstances. In England the alarm of the *armada* gave dignity and energy to the national character; in Scotland it gave being to a puritanical confederation, which half-a-century afterwards overturned the united monarchy of the two countries.

To permit this action of the northern on the southern kingdom, it was necessary that the two crowns should devolve to a single prince; and accordingly in the year 1603 James became the successor of Elizabeth, when he had already reigned thirty-six years in his own country. A more free communication must by that event have been opened between the two nations, and a reciprocal action of each upon the other must have been proportionally facilitated. The union of the two crowns at the same time made preparation for that more intimate combination, by which Great Britain was after another century consolidated into a single kingdom, and enabled to maintain the important station in the general combinations of Europe, in which it was placed by the revolution of the year 1688.

CHAPTER XIII.

Of the history of Ireland, from the commencement of the invasions of the Danes in the year 797, *to that of the reign of James I. in the year* 1603.

First invasion of the Danes in the year 797—Ruin of the Danish power, and of the ancient monarchy of Ireland, 1014—First invasion of the

English, 1170—Charter of Ireland, 1216—Parliament assembled, 1295—First effort of independence, 1342—Appellant jurisdiction obtained, 1356—Independence of the parliament claimed, 1460—Law of Poynings, 1495—Supremacy of the crown enacted, 1536—Henry VIII. entitled king of Ireland, 1541—Edward king, 1547—The English Liturgy introduced, 1550—Mary queen, 1553—Elizabeth queen, 1558—Act of Uniformity, 1560—Bull of Pope Pius V., 1569—Bull of pope Gregory XIII., 1580—Rebellion of the earl of Tyrone, 1595—Reduction of Ireland completed, 1603.

IRELAND, in the earliest period of its history, bore an important relation to the general system of Europe, as it afforded a hospitable asylum to the exiled learning of the continent and of Britain, when the agitations of the kingdoms recently constituted by the northern nations had driven it to seek a retreat in this sequestered region, and as it sent forth the missionaries of learning and religion, when the conquering arms and the policy of Charlemagne had given tranquillity and consistency to the west. When Ireland had discharged this important function in the general system, for which it had been fitted, not only by its local situation, but also by its political and moral circumstances, it ceased to have any direct relation to the arrangements of continental policy, and became gradually prepared for entering into that more limited connexion with the neighbouring country, which, after the lapse of six hundred and thirty years, has terminated in an incorporating union.

The commencement of the connexion with England in the reign of Henry II., and its progress to the final reduction of the island in the last year of that of Elizabeth, form the subject of the present chapter, a melancholy history of impotent attempts to conquer, and of ill-combined efforts to resist, of advanced civilisation deteriorating, instead of improving, the rude simplicity of the invaded country, and sinking into an imitation of the barbarism which it had thus engendered, and of legislative acts dictating to the people a reformation of religion, which no previous instruction had qualified them to appreciate, and opposed by rebellion and massacre. It is natural that the people of Ireland should have turned from the sickening contemplation of such scenes, and dwelled with rapture on the traditions of their early ancestors, until their imaginations arrayed this more ancient period in such visionary splendour, that its sober pretensions

to historic credit are dismissed as the fictions of ignorance and barbarity. But the review of the intervening period, however painful, may afford us valuable information in regard to the subsequent, and even the actual condition of our country, for we may discover in it the seeds of the parties, which have been matured in our own time, and the springs of the movements, by which we ourselves are agitated.

It is remarkable that the Danish invasions of Ireland, which, beginning about the close of the eighth century, drove from this country the literary and religious fugitives, for whose reception the continent was just then prepared, were also instrumental in breaking down its native government, and preparing it for a nominal, though only a nominal, submission to the feeble efforts of the English. It is also deserving of attention, that this other operation of the Danish invasions was completed at the very moment, in which the Irish dominion of the Danes was terminated[1], for the decisive battle of Clontarffe, fought in the year 1014, while it crushed the power of the Danes, was also the epoch of the ruin of the ancient monarchy of Ireland, the death of the celebrated Boirumhe[2], who perished in that engagement, having closed the series of princes regularly elected, and abandoned the country to the violences of contending chieftains.

From the death of Boirumhe to the first invasion of the English, or rather of the Welsh, elapsed a period of a hundred and fifty-six years, during which it is admitted that no

[1] The Irish dominion of the Danes was variable, in correspondence, as it seems, to its two distinct functions. When the invaders had gradually obtained some small settlements, Turges, a Norwegian, landed in the year 815, reduced the country to submission after some unsuccessful resistance, and at the close of thirty years was constituted monarch of Ireland. The oppressions of the Danes having roused the spirit of the Irish, this sovereignty was speedily suppressed. A new colony arrived in the year 864 under the command of three brothers, and promising to enrich the country by commerce, they were permitted to settle themselves in Limerick, Dublin, and Waterford. Of these maritime towns they soon possessed themselves, and receiving reinforcements from their original country, extended their territories, and constituted a very powerful, sometimes the most distinguished people of Ireland, retaining their settlements even after the battle of Clontarffe had put an end to their predominance.—Leland's Prel. Disc. O'Halloran's Introduct. to the Hist. of Ireland, vol. iii. p. 177.

[2] O'Halloran, ibid., p. 291.

regard was entertained for the original constitution, which, imperfect, as it was, might yet have been equally successful in resisting the efforts of these other enemies, and antiquaries have been obliged to consider the most powerful of the Irish princes as the nominal monarch of his time. When the death of the victorious Boirumhe had caused an unexpected vacancy of the throne[3], and the utter defeat of the common enemy had at the same time loosed the great bond of union among the conquerors, a chief, who had reserved his forces during the engagement, availed himself of his undiminished strength to intrude himself into the sovereignty. His example was imitated by almost all his successors. The inherent vices of the irregular government of Ireland were thus expanded into their full maturity[4], and the long series of confusion and weakness was continued to the very time, in which the invasions of England were commenced. The progress of the English king accordingly, as he advanced through Wales, gave occasion neither to any exertions on the part of Roderic O'Connor[5] the Irish monarch, nor to any confederacy among the inferior princes.

And here it may be interesting to notice the different influences, which the Danish invasions appear to have exercised upon the two neighbouring islands. In England, beginning in Northumberland and spreading towards the south, they served to consolidate and to complete the imperfect union of the Saxon monarchy, which had extended northward from Wessex the south-western district; and, when military violence had thus perfected what policy had begun, the peaceable abandonment of the throne bequeathed to the Saxon line of sovereigns all the advantages of this external interference. In Ireland, on the other hand, the invasions of the Danes served to aggravate the confusion of an ill-regulated government, and to prepare it for yielding a partial triumph to the feeble efforts of the English, distracted as these were by other wars, and by internal dissensions; and

[3] O'Halloran's Introduct. to the Hist. of Ireland, vol. iii. p. 281.

[4] The island was governed by five princes, one of whom claimed from the rest a precarious obedience: all these monarchies were elective, and to each prince a *tainist*, or successor, was chosen in his lifetime: all property moreover was continually fluctuating, a new division of the land of each district being made on the death or departure of each of the occupants.—Leland's Prel. Disc. [5] Leland, vol. i. p. 66.

their final suppression in a great and decisive conflict, while it left the scene open for the struggles of the new invaders, completed in its consequences the ruin of the Irish monarchy, and enfeebled the resistance of the natives.

While the civil power was thus rendered incapable of presenting any effectual resistance to the enterprises of the English, the ecclesiastical system of Ireland was brought into that connexion with the papacy, which gave influence to those bulls of the pontiffs, that affected to bestow upon Henry II. the sovereignty of the country[6]. The form of Christianity anciently professed by the people of Ireland not only was independent of the supremacy of Rome[7], but maintained in substance all the very same doctrines, which have since the reformation been the tenets of the established church. The ecclesiastical conquest was begun in a council assembled in the year 1111[8], and completed in another convened in the year 1152, twenty years previous to the publication of the bulls of Adrian IV. and Alexander III. These bulls accordingly were implicitly received by a council convened in Cashel; nor, until Henry VIII. had withdrawn his dominions from the supremacy of the papacy[9] was any other foundation sought for the pretension of the sovereign of England to authority in Ireland. Deeply has Ireland im-

[6] Adrian founded his pretension to make this grant on a claim of jurisdiction over all islands, to which the faith of Christ had been communicated; and this claim, according to John of Salisbury, rested on the pretended donation of Constantine, which has been long ago rejected as a forgery.—Usher's Disc. on the Religion Anciently professed by the Irish and British, ch. xi. Doctor Phelan has enumerated four distinct explanations of the origin of the peculiar connexion of Ireland and the papacy:—1. The donation of Constantine; 2. A divine right to all islands, inferred from the prophecies; 3. That a king of Munster and some other chiefs, having visited Rome as pilgrims, had surrendered their dominions, and retired into a cloister; and 4, which was the favourite solution, that in the time of St. Patrick the whole nation, grateful for the knowledge of the true religion, had ceded their island to the see of Rome. The third was liable to this obvious objection, that the Irish principalities, though hereditary in the family, were elective as to the individual.—Hist. of the Policy of the Church of Rome in Ireland, pp. 12, 13. Dublin, 1827. [7] Usher's Discourse.

[8] O'Halloran, vol. iii. pp. 320—328. [9] Elizabeth, in the Irish act of attainder of John O'Neal, judged it necessary on this account to derive her title from Gurmonde, son to king Belinus.—Leland, vol. ii. p. 244.

bibed the tincture, which it then received; and well may it confound the presumption of human speculation, that the same attachment to the see of Rome, which was thus constituted the original ground and stay of the connexion with England, became eventually, in the natural order of causes and effects, the active principle of the most strenuous and repeated efforts to separate from that connexion.

Henry had conceived, soon after his accession, the design of annexing Ireland to his other dominions, and with this view had procured the papal sanction for his enterprise, as necessary for extending the influence of true religion. The occupation, which he soon afterwards found in repressing the insurrection of his brother, in securing and tranquillising the various parts of his territories, and in maintaining his contest with the inflexible spirit of Becket, diverted him from the prosecution of his plan, until the disorders, which had grown out of the decay and corruption of the Irish government, presented an opportunity not to be declined. The immediate occasion has been represented by Giraldus Cambrensis, as furnished by the resentment entertained against Dermod king of Leinster, on account of his intrigue with Dervorghal the wife of O'Ruarc, prince of Breffney or Leitrim, with some adjacent districts. The historian of Ireland has however collected from the Irish annalists[10], that this incident occurred sixteen years before the invasion of Henry, and only gave occasion to a mutual hostility between these chieftains, which determined them to attach themselves to opposite parties in the struggle for the sovereignty of Ireland. It was in this struggle the fortune of the prince, with whom Dermod had connected himself, to be defeated and slain by his enemies; Roderic O'Connor, the leader of the other party, having become in consequence of this event the undisputed possessor of the sovereignty, wreaked his vengeance on Dermod the auxiliary of his rival; and this prince, having been deposed by Roderic from the throne of Leinster, was driven to seek from the king of England the means of his restoration.

The embarrassments, in which Henry was then involved, rendering it impracticable to indulge his long-formed wish of making a royal expedition into Ireland, he furnished the

[10] Leland, vol. i. p. 14.

Irish prince with letters of credit, authorising his subjects to engage in the enterprise. A small force, led by two Welsh chieftains, accordingly arrived in the year 1170, and took possession of Wexford. Small as this force was, the successes, which it obtained amidst the dissensions of the Irish, alarmed the jealousy of Henry, rendering him apprehensive that his subjects might effect a conquest for themselves. When therefore he had extricated himself from the difficulties, by which he had been detained, he himself proceeded to Ireland, nearly two years and a half after the first expedition of his people. About six months however were all the time, which he could devote to the undertaking, being then recalled to England by the consequences of his contention with Becket; and Ireland was unavoidably abandoned to the disorders of a military aristocracy, to which he found it necessary to intrust the prosecution of his scheme of conquest.

In England the Saxon system had formed the best possible preparation for the Norman. Its principles bore such an affinity to the feudal regulations of Normandy, that the laws of William could without much violence be engrafted upon those of Edward the Confessor, while these were so much more favourable to the general liberty, that they presented a rallying point under all the oppressions of the conqueror and his successors, until the struggles of six centuries had adjusted the balance of the constitution. The brehon-law of Ireland bore no correspondence to the feudal regulations[11], and therefore admitted no combination. Its elections, which pervaded all the gradations of authority, were inconsistent with the subordination of the feudal investiture; and the perpetually repeated gavelling of the

[11] General Vallancy has derived the word *brehon* from *breith*, which in the Celtic language signifies either the *judge* or the *sentence*. Some of the brehon-laws, he remarks, are prefaced with a declaration, that they were the pagan laws, revised and corrected by Patrick; some are evidently of more modern date; some, apparently the most ancient, inflict on a pagan culprit a fine double of that which in similar cases was imposed on a Christian.—Pref. to a Tract on the Brehon-Laws of Ireland, Collectan., vol. i. Whatever may have been the defects of these laws, they must have been well administered, for Sir John Davies has represented the Irish of his time as in peace more fearful of offending the law, than the English, or any other nation whatsoever.—Hist. Tracts, p. 201. Dublin, 1787.

property of each entire sept at the decease of each member, was not less repugnant to the whole system of the feudal tenures. We accordingly find, through the long contentious interval between Henry II. and James I., the laws of England and Ireland in direct and irreconcileable opposition; nor was it practicable to accomplish the general establishment of the former, until an unsuccessful rebellion afforded an opportunity for completing the suppression of the latter.

The respective circumstances of the victorious sovereigns, in the two cases of England and Ireland, were not less contrasted than the principles of their legal systems. William, establishing his residence in England, added to the crown so enormous a weight of authority, as compressed the several orders of the state, the conquerors equally as the conquered, into one united mass of subjects, all jealous of their liberties, and anxious to moderate the excessive power of the prince. Henry and his successors, on the other hand, rarely and but for very short times visiting Ireland, and unable to give much attention to its concerns in their absence, almost relinquished it to a number of rapacious leaders, who found an interest in resisting the extension of the regulated principles of the English government, in many instances even renouncing the name and character of their original country, and voluntarily degenerating into the barbarous license of Irish chieftains.

In these circumstances the original conquest of Ireland was necessarily very limited and imperfect. Henry II. did not even visit its western and northern districts[12]; and though he received the submissions of the chieftains of Leinster and Munster, he did not construct a single castle, or establish one garrison among the Irish, but departing out of Ireland five months after his arrival without striking a blow, left no other true subjects than the English adventurers, by whom he had been preceded. The expedition of that prince was indeed a mere pageant, from which he was soon recalled by an insurrection of his sons. The real conquest was the work of adventurers, and was deeply tainted by the miserable policy, which must belong to the predatory enterprises of individuals, guided only by a consideration of private interest.

[12] Leland, vol. i. p. 84. Davies's Hist. Tracts, p. 9.

Roderic O'Connor, during the expedition of Henry, intrenched himself upon the banks of the Shannon for the security of Connaught[13], and the chiefs of Ulster remained in their own districts without manifesting any disposition to submit to the English monarch. At length[14], two years after the departure of Henry, Roderic, despairing of the weakness of his own government, sent his ambassador to treat with that prince. The treaty then concluded strongly marks the narrow limits of the English dominion. The sovereignty of Roderic over the native Irish was acknowledged on the condition of performing homage, and paying tribute to the king of England; and the English law and government were enforced only within the English pale, comprehending little more than the province of Leinster, even within which the native Irish might, at the option of their immediate lords, be permitted to live according to their own laws, and in subjection to the Irish monarch, on the condition of paying a tribute instead of other services. So little capable was Roderic of affording any effectual support to the dominion of Henry, even if he had been so disposed, that he passed the concluding twelve years of his life in a monastery[15], unnoticed by the factions contending for his kingdom.

The causes why Ireland had not been sooner subdued, have been examined by Sir John Davies. The primary evil was that, before the conclusion of the reign of Elizabeth, no considerable exertion of national force had ever been employed for reducing it. Henry II.[16] was embarrassed by the rebellion of his sons: John, Henry III. and Edward II. by the wars of the barons: Edward I. by the wars of Wales and Scotland: Edward III. and Henry V. by those of France: Richard II., Henry IV., Henry VI., and Edward IV., by the domestic struggle for the crown of England. Edward IV. indeed was soon freed from the embarrassment of civil war, and established in the quiet possession of the throne; but, when his kingdom had been sufficiently recovered from its exhausted condition, he revived the pretension to the crown of France, and died of vexation, when he discovered that he had been deluded by the French king.

[13] Leland, vol. i. pp. 72, 73. [14] Ibid., pp. 103, &c. [15] Ibid. vol. i. p. 165. [16] Davies's Hist. Tracts, pp. 70—74.

Richard III. was never during his short reign in quiet possession of the throne. Henry VII., during more than the half of his reign, was occupied in repressing the remaining adherents of the family of York, and during the remainder in improving his revenue. The attention of Henry VIII. was engrossed by his continental policy, and his separation from the see of Rome. Besides the impediments created by the minority of Edward VI., and by the sex of Mary, the care of promoting the reformation in the one reign, and of repressing it in the other, was quite sufficient to divert these two sovereigns from the reduction of Ireland. The attention of Elizabeth also was long occupied by more urgent considerations immediately appertaining to her safety, but was at length solicited to the enterprise by the apprehension that this country might fall into the possession of her enemies. When a general defection had provoked an extraordinary effort, the conclusion of her reign was distinguished by the completion of the procrastinated conquest.

A consequence of this mode of proceeding was that the laws of England were not communicated to the Irish people[17], but that only the English colonies, and five septs of the Irish within the pale, which had been specially enfranchised, were admitted to the enjoyment of so much favour. The great body of the natives were reputed enemies, not merely aliens, so that to kill a mere Irishman in time of peace was adjudged to be no felony. This did not arise from the repugnance of the Irish, for they were sufficiently sensible of the advantages, which these laws bestowed, and were eager to obtain them. Charters of denization were accordingly purchased by individuals among them in all ages, and they petioned Edward I. for this boon, offering eight thousand marks on the condition of receiving it. Nor was the king averse from a policy so salutary, but found it necessary to refer the consideration of the request to the prelates and nobles of Ireland, by whom the favour was withheld.

This conduct Sir John Davies [18] has explained by assuming that those, who held the government of Ireland, acted on the principle of a perpetual war, by which the English should extirpate the Irish, and possess themselves of the

[17] Davies's Hist. Tracts, pp. 75—89. [18] Hist. of the Policy of the Church of Rome in Ireland, pp. 34—38.

vacant territory. Dr. Phelan has ascribed it chiefly to the desire of the bishops to establish a dominion for themselves, to which the canon law was more suitable than that of England. This opinion he has maintained by representing, that Edward first addressed a letter on the subject to the lord justice, and, when he had replied that far the greater number of the barons were absent frem the seat of government, and many of the others were minors, so that it would be impossible to assemble a council sufficiently numerous or respectable, and the Irish had renewed their supplications, the king then addressed the prelates, nobles, and other English, commanding them to proceed to the consideration of the matter notwithstanding the objections, which had been pleaded. It cannot be ascertained, whether this council ever met. It is certain that the people were not gratified, and that this unjustifiable policy of the Irish government generated a national feud, which was afterwards yet more exasperated by a difference of religion, and in this state of extraordinary excitement became a powerful agent in the general combinations of the empire.

The influence of this policy has been well illustrated by Sir John Davies[19], in comparing the case of Ireland with that of Wales, the original laws of the latter having been in many particulars similar to those of the former country. Edward I., as soon as he had completed the reduction of Wales, introduced such a modification of its laws, as in a considerable degree assimilated them to those of England; and, when the insurrections of the barons, the wars of France, and the struggle of the rival houses, had so withdrawn from Wales the attention of the English government, that it relapsed into its former condition, Henry VIII. perfected that which had been begun by Edward, receiving it into an incorporating union with his kingdom, and abolishing all usages which might have maintained its distinctness. The result of this different treatment was that the country became in a short time a scene of order and civilisation, whereas the feud of Ireland is still shaking our repose.

Another consequence of the abandonment of the war to exertions of individuals, was that possessions so large were granted to the first adventurers[20], that nothing remained to

[19] Hist. Tracts, pp. 99, 100. [20] Ibid., pp. 102—119.

be granted to the natives upon their submission. It has accordingly been remarked, that during three hundred years no Irish lord obtained a grant of his country from the crown except the king of Thomond, who had a grant during the minority of Henry III., and Roderic O'Connor, whose territory however was taken from his successor to transfer it to an English adventurer. In these circumstances no progress could be made towards the reduction of Ireland, for every chieftain must have felt, that all his importance depended on the continuance of the struggle, since submission must have reduced him to the lowest dependence on the leaders of his English enemies.

Through the reaction of the misgovernment of Ireland upon the English settlers, the hostility of the natives against the English connexion was reinforced by the accession of their antagonists, who had at length degenerated from the laws and usages of their original country into those of the people, whom they vainly laboured to subdue. The civil government[21] became so weak, that the lords would not suffer the rigid justice of the English laws to be executed among them; and the habits of the Irish were found to be so much more suitable to their licentious dispositions[22], that they became mere Irish in their language, names, apparel, and all their usages.

Though a very great degeneracy prevailed among the inhabitants of English race, the principles of a parliamentary constitution had fortunately been introduced and preserved, to form in more favourable times an organ of national improvement and happiness. The origin of the Irish parliament is however involved in some obscurity and uncertainty. The charter granted to the English inhabitants of Ireland in the first year of the reign of Henry III., in imitation of that which had been extorted by the English from John his predecessor, seems to prove that no legislative assembly then existed in that country, as it omits the clauses of the great charter, which regulate the summonses of the members of the great council, reserving them, with some other matters, for more

[21] Hist. Tracts, pp. 125, 159. [22] The Irish laws, like other ancient codes, punished the most heinous offences only by fines; and they also authorised the chiefs to levy arbitrary exactions for the support of their forces.—Ibid., pp. 126, 131.

mature consideration. The first assembly[23], which appears to have deserved the name of parliament, was convened in the year 1295, the same in which the representatives of boroughs were first summoned to the English parliament, and consequently the same which is the epoch of the completed representation of the people of England. The urgent expenses, occasioned by the various enterprises of Edward I., forced him to resort for assistance to all classes of his subjects, and in both countries at the same time gave existence to the germ of future assemblies of popular representatives. Before this time doubtless frequent assemblies of the prelates and nobles had been held, and to the latter[24], in conjunction with the officers of the crown, had been committed by Henry II. the power of electing a temporary successor to a deceased chief governor. But, as before this time we discover no legislative interposition for redressing the evils of the state, and the laws of England[25], however disregarded and violated in practice, appear to have been considered as the public code, these assemblies seem rather to have been the councils of the executive government than national legislatures.

A claim of legislative independence of the English government has been from time to time maintained, as circumstances created interests opposed to its supremacy. In the struggle of the two royal houses[26] the duke of York acquired an ascendency over the councils of Ireland, and in the year 1460 caused the parliament to frame a most strenuous declaration of its independence, for protecting him against his enemies of the house of Lancaster, which then was in possession of the throne. As the party of the duke of York became successful in the same year, this first declaration of Irish independence was not encountered by a contradiction. When the introduction of the reformation had given occasion to a division of parties in the Irish legislature, a new prin-

[23] Hist. of the Polit. Connexion between England and Ireland, p. 87. Lond., 1780. [24] Leland, vol. i. p. 83. [25] Henry II. held a council at Lismore, in which the laws of England were thankfully accepted; John established the English laws and customs in this country, with the assistance of a council which he had brought with him; Henry III. at different times renewed the ordinance of John; and Edward I., in the like manner, by his own authority transmitted the statutes of England to be observed in Ireland.—Ibid., pp. 75—77, 95.

[26] Ibid., vol. ii. p. 42.

ciple of independence operated, the Roman Catholics[27], who prevailed in the house of commons, maintaining this cause against the house of lords; and the controversy, thus begun in the year 1640, was still more vehemently agitated in consequence of the act of the following year passed in the English parliament, for suppressing the rebellion of Ireland. The claim of independence was naturally revived by James II., when he had fled from England, and was endeavouring to maintain his royalty in the sister-island. But, though it was thus cherished by the formation of a Roman Catholic party in Ireland, and was generally resisted by the Protestants of this period, in their anxiety to strengthen the connexion with England, it was not wholly destitute of support among the latter body, many of them having been alarmed by the pretension advanced in the act of Charles. When the revolution had established the principles of liberty in England, the feelings of Irish Protestants caught the sympathy of independence, and one of the representatives of the university in parliament published a statement of the claim of his country[28], which was committed to the flames by the government of England. The depression of the Roman Catholics, which followed the revolution, having extinguished all jealousy of that party, the Protestants became gradually more desirous of extricating themselves from their dependence on the English legislature. At length, in a season of national embarrassment, the demand of an armed people, animated by the example of the American colonies, and cheered by the eloquent pleadings of Grattan, became irresistible.

That the parliament of England did at all times make laws binding Ireland, that these laws were commonly executed without any confirmation by the Irish parliament, and that the administration of justice in Ireland was subordinate to the authority of the English tribunals, appear to have been established in an elaborate argument[29], composed by one of the judges of Ireland in consequence of the controversy occasioned by the act of Charles. But, though in every period, almost to the very time of the formal vindication of Irish

[27] Harris's Hibernica, part ii. pref. [28] The case of Ireland's being bound by Acts of Parliament in England, stated by W. Molyneaux, Esq. Dubl., 1698. [29] Serjeant Mayart's Answer to Sir Richard Bolton.—Harris's Hib., part ii.

independence, numerous instances of the subordination of the Irish to the English legislature may be found, yet the parliament gradually acquired importance from a variety of circumstances and contingencies, so that, even within the time at present considered, it approached to the rank of a distinct and independent legislature.

Long indeed before the claim of independence was distinctly asserted, circumstances had presented themselves, which gave being and encouragement to the spirit afterwards manifested. So early as in the year 1228[30], or about the half of a century after the first invasion, the aversion from the justice and severity of the English laws became so prevalent among the descendants of the colonists, that it was found necessary to transmit a representation to the king, urging the expediency of his interposition, though so little was the effect of that interposition, that it was repeated at the end of only eighteen years. In the reign of Edward I.[31], who ascended the throne a century after the invasion of Henry II., the inhabitants of the English race began not merely to disregard the English laws, which would have restrained their violences, but also to assume the dress and appearance of the native Irish, renouncing the character, and even the names of their original country. The disaffection, thus engendered by the degeneracy of the descendants of the English settlers, was exasperated by the impatience of Edward III., who, besides various arbitrary ordinances[32] for enforcing a revenue from Ireland, issued in the year 1342 a decree, publicly proscribing the English by race as unfit to be intrusted with offices, and enjoining that only English by birth should be so employed. Such was the resentment excited by this ordinance, that, when the chief governor assembled a parliament in Dublin, a rival assembly, more numerous and more respectable, was convened at Kilkenny. The representations of this assembly, irregular as it was, obtained a gracious and condescending answer from the king, who was eager to commence his expedition into France, in which he hoped to procure the assistance of the Irish lords. Fourteen years afterwards[33], desirous of allaying the indignation, which his former proceedings had

[30] Leland, vol. i. pp. 223, 224. [31] Ibid., p. 256. [32] Ibid., pp. 297—305. [33] Ibid., p. 312.

occasioned, the same monarch directed his Irish parliament to take cognisance of the judgments of the inferior courts, and finally determine the rights of his subjects of Ireland, who had been before obliged to resort to England for redress. Twenty years however after this concession[34], or in the year 1376, the impatience of this military sovereign gave birth to an extraordinary transaction, which deeply wounded the feeling of national independence. Disappointed in his attempt to procure supplies from the parliament, he summoned a body of delegates of the several orders of the state to repair to England, there to treat with him and his council. The delegation was sent agreeably to his summons; but the archbishop of Armagh[35], the nobles, and the commons, unanimously protested against the proceeding as a violation of their rights.

The parliament, which seems to have derived its being from the military embarrassments of the first Edward, appears thus to have owed the spirit of an independent legislature to those of his grandson, though the claim of independence was not distinctly advanced, until the struggle of the two houses of York and Lancaster afforded a favourable occasion. The independence of the Irish parliament received indeed a check in the year 1495 from the important law of Poynings[36], which gave to the privy councils of the two countries a negative before debate on all its proceedings. Such however was at that time the condition of Ireland, that this law, which in a later period was reprobated as the badge of national degradation and dependence, was then and afterwards[37] cherished as the protection of the commons against the oppressions of licentious nobles. A law enacted in the year 1541, under the government of Henry VIII., served on the other hand to augment the importance of the

[34] Leland, vol. i. pp. 327—329. [35] The archbishop protested, that the clergy did not grant to their representatives any power of assenting to any subsidy. The nobles and commons reserved to themselves the power of giving such assent, while they gave to their representatives the power of treating and consulting. Whether, or how far, the necessities of the king were supplied, we are not informed.—Ibid.

[36] It is entitled an act, that no parliament be holden in this land, until the acts be certified into England. It was amended by the act of the third and fourth of Philip and Mary, which empowered the chief governor and council to certify during the session such other causes or considerations, as they think expedient. [37] Ibid., vol. ii. pp. 242, 243, 296, 515.

Irish parliament. To give greater dignity to the government[38], and at the same time more effectually to renounce the supremacy of the pope, it was resolved that the king of England should thenceforward be entitled king, and not merely lord of Ireland, and an act of parliament was accordingly passed for that purpose in each legislature[39]. The change was favourable to the authority of the government, for all the nobles of English descent[40] and the leaders of the Irish tribes were emulous in declaring their fidelity to the new king, acknowledging him as in that quality the head of the church.

The royal supremacy, which in England had been acknowledged in the year 1534, was recognised two years afterwards in the parliament of Ireland[41], but experienced a strenuous opposition from the clergy and the people. The primate was the leader of this resistance in opposition to the archbishop of Dublin, who had been advanced to that see for the purpose of effecting the change. A commission was speedily despatched to him from Rome, enjoining him and his followers to persevere in supporting the papal authority, to resist all edicts adverse to the church of Rome, and to declare all those accursed, who should hold any power superior to that church. That this measure might not be an ineffectual menace, the agents of Rome addressed themselves particularly to O'Neal, the chieftain of the north, who eagerly availed himself of this opportunity of recovering the importance of his family, by proclaiming himself the champion of the papal rights. The efforts of the Romish party were after some time frustrated by the force of the government; and, as the Irish seemed generally inclined to submission, it was deemed good policy to procure, that the king of England should thenceforward bear the title of king of Ireland.

The same parliament[42], which thus constituted Ireland a kingdom, ordained also that all monasteries and religious

[38] Leland, vol. ii. p. 178. [39] Hume has represented this as if done exclusively by an act of the English parliament, whereas it was in the same year enacted also in Ireland. [40] Doctor Phelan's Hist. of the Policy of the Church of Rome in Ireland, pp. 82—91. These nobles and chieftains at the same time accepted titles of honour from their new king.
[41] Leland, vol. ii. pp. 157, 162, 171—177. [42] Davies, pp. 184, 190.

houses should be suppressed, as in England. So imperfectly however was this ordinance executed, that the abbies of three northern counties, Tyrone, Tyrconnell or Donegal, and Fermanagh, subsisted until the reign of James I., who also first appointed bishops to the three sees of Derry, Raphoe, and Clogher. The English liturgy, which had been prepared in the year 1548, was in the year 1550 introduced into Ireland; but the spirit of opposition was still so prevalent, that it appears to have been deemed expedient to enforce it by a proclamation[43], instead of attempting to procure for it the sanction of a parliament.

The early death of Edward VI. and the accession of Mary swept away almost every appearance of the reformation, though the persecuting spirit of Mary was happily averted from this country by one of those contingencies[44], which baffle the combinations of men. In England, where the reformed religion had been very generally embraced, a brief period of persecution might be useful in purifying the spirit of the Protestants; but in Ireland too little had yet been done for religious improvement to render this fiery trial beneficial, and it was accordingly withheld. When the reformed worship[45] was restored in the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth, the repeated changes gave weight to the representations of the advocates of the church of Rome. The people were on the other hand encouraged in their opposition by the temporary suspension of the reformation, and urged to resistance by denunciations of the divine ven-

[43] Leland, vol. ii. p. 195. 'The proclamation was not incautiously worded. It expressed nothing more, than that the prayers of the church had been translated into the mother-tongue, for the edification of the people.'—Ibid. [44] Cole dean of St. Paul's who was sent into Ireland with a commission to the state, for proceeding against heretics with the utmost severity, having showed his commission at Chester with much exultation in the presence of his hostess, allied to some Protestants, who had retired to Dublin, she stole his commission, substituting in its place a pack of cards, which he accordingly produced for it to the Irish council. The death of Mary prevented the renewal of the commission. For this story we have the authority of primate Usher and the earl of Cork.—Ibid., vol. ii. p. 214, note. [45] As a sufficient number of English ministers could not be procured, it was enacted in the second year of Elizabeth, that those ministers, who should not understand the English language, might read the liturgy in Latin. The reasons assigned are that the Irish language was difficult to be printed, and that few could read the Irish letters.—Ibid., p. 225, note.

geance[46], and by assurances of a powerful support, both from the Roman pontiff, and from the king of Spain, whose subjects[47] with a traditional feeling of kindness they regarded as their kinsmen. The foreign wars of Elizabeth[48] at the same time caused her to neglect the concerns of Ireland, and even to give to its disaffected inhabitants opportunities of learning the use of arms in her service, both at home and on the continent.

For the grand explosion, which should make room for the introduction of a more improved order of society, nothing more was required except a leader, whose resources and abilities should enable him to combine the wide-spread materials of rebellion. Such a leader was supplied in Hugh O'Neal, earl of Tyrowen or Tyrone. The sept of O'Neal was anciently the most impatient of the English dominion[49], and had gradually wrested from it several of their most valuable settlements in Ulster. Hugh, who was at this time chieftain of the sept, had enjoyed peculiar advantages of instruction[50]. As his father had been by the favour of Henry VIII. created baron of Dungannon, he had received the benefit of an English education; and as, on account of the illegitimate birth of that father, he had been less respected in his sept, he entered early into the service of the English government, with which he maintained a constant intercourse. By the refinement thus acquired he was enabled to delude the queen and her deputy with false appearances of attachment, until his schemes were ripe for execution. He began his rebellion in the year 1595[51] with a successful action, which united with him the disaffected in every part of Ireland, and spreading the insurrection over all the open country, confined the royalists to towns. In this enterprise[52], he was assisted by supplies of money and ammunition from Spain, and encouraged with assurances that he should soon receive a powerful reinforcement from that country, and by

[46] Leland, vol. ii. pp. 267, 268, 274, 281. [47] Seventeen ships of the *armada*, containing about five thousand four hundred men, having been driven by storms on the northern and north-western coasts of Ireland, their crews were received as kinsmen with the utmost kindness and hospitality.—Ibid., p. 312. [48] Ibid., p. 305. [49] Ibid., p. 39. [50] Ibid., pp. 222, 306. [51] Ibid., pp. 348—350. [52] Ibid., pp. 356, 363, 364, 368.

the benedictions of the Roman pontiff, who also sent to him, as the prince of Ulster, a consecrated plume, which was gravely declared to be composed of the feathers of a phœnix, and issued a bull conferring on him and all his followers the same spiritual indulgences, which had been granted to those who fought for the Holy Land.

The conduct of two English governors co-operated to bring forward the crisis of this rebellion. Sir William Fitz-William, who was deputy in the commencement of the disorders, was corrupt, weak, and oppressive[53]; and his misconduct assisted, instead of opposing, the artful machinations of O'Neal. The Earl of Essex again, who with the authority of lord-lieutenant was afterwards intrusted with a considerable force for reducing the insurgents, by his injudicious management of the war in directing his arms towards the south, left the northern rebels unopposed, and when he at length marched into Ulster, suffered himself to be deceived by the Irish chieftain in an interview, and even tempted to join in the rebellion. A third governor, lord Mountjoy, was however a man of very different character, and by his wisdom and energy broke the power of the insurgents very seasonably before the arrival of the Spanish force, by which they were to be assisted. The entire suppression of the rebellion[54], effected almost in the last moments of Elizabeth, made room for the salutary efforts of her successor, to introduce among the people of Ireland the blessings of order and tranquillity.

Though the humiliation of O'Neal prepared the country for improvement, yet the struggle had given being to a Roman Catholic party strongly opposed to the government. It is indeed probable that, if Ireland had not been agitated by foreign influence, tranquillity might have been preserved,

[53] Leland. vol. ii. pp. 311, &c. [54] Mac-Geoghegan has stated that O'Neal stipulated for the freedom of his religion; Hist. de l'Irlande, tome iii. p. 617. Paris, 1758, &c. But this statement, which the circumstances of the event render utterly improbable, is directly inconsistent with the account, which Moryson has given of his submission from the original record. In this submission, which was of the humblest kind, and performed by the earl kneeling, he renounced and abjured all foreign power whatsoever, and all kind of dependency upon any other potentate, but her majesty the queen.—Moryson's Hist. of Ireland, vol. ii. p. 303. Dublin, 1735.

and that the religion of the government would gradually have prevailed among the people. As in the time of Henry VIII. the acknowledgment of the royal supremacy was alone proposed, no very general opposition was experienced, this being regarded by the Roman Catholics as relating to the temporal authority of the sovereign[55]. The reign of Edward was too short to have much operation in a country so imperfectly reduced to obedience, nor was any thing proposed except the introduction of the English liturgy, to which objection appears to have been made by the Irish primate chiefly as to a translation[56], which would enable every unlettered layman to say mass. Elizabeth again proceeded with so much moderation[57], that before the year 1595 religion was never the professed cause of hostility[58], and in the struggle then begun she was supported by a great number of the principal Roman Catholics, by several even of the ancient families of Ireland.

Foreign influence however was strongly and repeatedly exerted in opposition to the peace and improvement of Ireland. A Roman Catholic historian has expressed an opinion[59], that the Irish had been solicited by several foreign princes so early as in the year 1538, or in the very commencement of the reformation. But the strong excitement of Irish bigotry was furnished by the letters of three pontiffs[60], two of which were addressed to the people of Ireland, and the third to O'Neal then in arms against Elizabeth. By the

[55] Mac-Geoghegan, tome iii. p. 384. [56] Ibid., tome ii. p. 351.

[57] Elizabeth did in the year 1591 issue a declaration for the discovery of agents sent by the pope and the king of Spain from foreign seminaries to excite disaffection among the Irish; but, besides that this measure was amply justified by the necessity of defending her government against their machinations, it appears to have been limited to that necessity, for the queen was even in the war of O'Neal supported by the greater number of the Roman Catholic lords and chieftains, as appears from the unsuspicious testimony of O'Sullivan, and from the manifesto of O'Neal, published in the year 1593.—O'Conor's Hist. Address, part. i. pp. 13—20. 1810. [58] 'The first attempt,' (to excite a holy war) says primate Lombard, 'was by James of Desmond, who was the first leader of that first attempt 1570, being appointed general that year by the pope. On his death Gregory XIII. issued another commission, dated Rome, May 13, 1580, and this was the second. But those attempts failed.'—Ibid., p. 253. [59] Mac-Geoghegan, tome ii. p. 308. [60] Ibid., pp. 409, 437, 588.

first of these letters, which Pius V. issued in the year 1569, Elizabeth was pronounced to be destitute of all right to the throne of England, and her subjects were discharged from all obligation of allegiance. By the second, which Gregory XIII. issued in the year 1580, the same plenary absolution was offered to all, who should aid the enemies of the queen, which had been granted to those, who contended with the Turks for the recovery of the Holy Land. By the third, which Clement VIII. addressed particularly to O'Neal in the year 1601, that chieftain was hailed as the champion of the church, and the papal benedictions were showered upon him, and upon the other princes and nobles, who had engaged in the holy cause. The bulls of the pontiffs were supported by the arms of Spain, and the universities of that kingdom were in the year 1603 employed to determine[61], that the Roman Catholics of Ireland were bound to give their assistance to O'Neal in the war, which he waged against Elizabeth. By these interpositions a principle of bigotry has been planted in this country, which has since produced all its bitter fruits. The great mass of the population has been set in hostility to the government, and so deeply were the Romish clergy of Ireland impressed with the lesson then inculcated, that within our own time they have been even carried further in their resistance to the control of the state[62], than the policy of Rome would have urged them to proceed.

[61] Mac-Geoghegan, tome ii. p. 593. [62] Mr. Butler has furnished the following chronology of the discussion of the negative, which it was proposed to allow to the crown on the appointment of the Roman Catholic prelates of Ireland. In the year 1799 the measure was approved by them. In the year 1808 it was reported by doctor Milner as agreeable to them. In the same year it was declared by them to be *inexpedient*. In the year 1815 cardinal Litta declared the acquiescence of the pope in such a measure. To this communication the Irish prelates declared their decided opposition. In the year 1816 the pope remonstrated with them on the unreasonableness of their apprehensions. In the year 1817 the Irish prelates remonstrated with the pope, praying for a *concordat*, which might render the election of their successors domestic and independent. In the year 1818 the pope replied to this remonstrance, ordering them *to be at ease*. This command however appears to have been disregarded, for in the year 1821 the prelates of Leinster, assembled with the clergy of the arch-diocese of Dublin, declared their *conscientious uneasiness* on the subject.—Hist. Mem., vol. iv. pp. 479, &c.

In comparing the two accessory members of the triple government we observe that, while in Scotland one combination of causes political and religious prepared a presbyterian church, which furnished the support of the whig interest of the principal country, another in Ireland gave a beginning indeed to an established church corresponding to that of England, but at the same time attached the majority of the people to the cause and interest of Rome, and thereby provided an antagonist force for supporting the congenial interest of arbitrary government. The double enginery was thus prepared at the conclusion of the reign of Elizabeth, by which the oscillation of the constitution between those extremes was to be maintained under the family of the Stuarts, so that at the close of seventy-five years it might settle in the middle point of regulated freedom.

The wisdom of Elizabeth in providing for the improvement of Ireland, was long baffled by the public commotions. At length in the year 1584[63], when the death of the earl of Desmond, and the reduction of his followers, had afforded a favourable opportunity for executing schemes of political reformation, the government was committed to Sir John Perrot, a man well acquainted with the interests of his country, and reverenced by all its inhabitants. His wise object was to extend, as much as possible, throughout Ireland the benefits of the English laws. Such was the efficacy of this genuine policy, however late adopted, that, though Mary[64], with all her attachment to the religion of Rome, had experienced in Ireland as much resistance, as had before been encountered by the protestant Edward, yet in the reign of Elizabeth, a powerful party of the native Irish both disregarded the call of the Spanish commander Don Juan de'ol Aquila[65], and supported the cause of loyalty against the domestic enemies of the queen. For promoting the reformation of religion little could then be done with any present effect. As it was perceived that the doctrines of religion could be communicated only through a language generally understood, provision was made in the year 1571 for printing in the Irish language the New Testament and the English liturgy[66]. The former of these works however was not

[63] Leland, vol. ii. p. 291.
[64] Mac-Geoghegan, tome ii. p. 375.
[65] O'Conor's Hist. Address, part i. pp. 10, &c.
[66] Richardson's

accomplished until the year 1602, nor the latter until the succeeding reign, although an Irish catechism had been published in the interval. For providing a succession of educated ministers of the established church, the university of Dublin was founded in the year 1593; but the institution was engaged in a continued struggle with difficulties until the restoration of Charles II. had quieted the country, and therefore in that earlier period could have little operation in extending the influence of true religion, by sending into the established church a more qualified clergy.

CHAPTER XIV.

Of the history of Great Britain and Ireland, from the accession of James I. in the year 1603, *to that of Charles I. in the year* 1625.

James I. king in the year 1603—Hampton-Court-conference, 1604—Gunpowder-plot, 1605—The king declared absolute in Scotland, and the annexation of church-lands dissolved, 1606—Plantation of Ulster in Ireland, 1609—Ecclesiastical power of the bishops in Scotland established, 1610—First general parliament—Calvinistical articles established in Ireland, 1615—The Independents, 1616—Articles of Perth, 1618—Protestation of the commons of England, 1621—Bacon.

THE reign of the first prince of the family of the Stuarts was distinguished by various movements in the several territories of the triple monarchy, all preparatory to the grand struggle which shortly succeeded. In this reign the party of the Puritans of England became more distinctly developed, and the English house of commons asserted that importance, which afterwards, urged onward by the puritanical spirit of the time, overthrew the authority of the king, the church, and the nobility. In the same reign an injudicious and violent effort to assimilate the ecclesiastical institutions of Scotland to those of England, provoked a resistance in the former country, which powerfully acted upon the latter, furnishing

Short Hist. of Attempts to Convert the Popish Natives of Ireland, pp. 13—18. London, 1712.

the immediate excitement of its agitations. In this reign also Ireland became prepared to take its part in the commotions of England, not only as it was then for the first time reduced in some degree to the order and tranquillity of regular government, but also as a puritanical party of Protestants was formed within it, to assist in controlling the predominant interest of the Roman Catholics. The right position of the constitution of England was at length adjusted at the revolution, when two contrary excesses of political movement had carried it to the opposite extremes of republicanism and arbitrary power, the two accessory governments of Scotland and Ireland acting as the escapements, which in the machinery of a clock sustain and regulate the motion of the pendulum. Scotland gave the impulse to the puritanical party, as Ireland was the support of the contrary party of the Roman Catholics.

It seems to have held a principal place among the peculiar advantages, by which the formation of the English government has been eminently favoured, that the development of its popular principles was hastened, and as it were forced forward, by exciting causes, instead of being left to its own ordinary and regular process. If the struggle of the commons with the monarchy and the aristocracy had been postponed, until it had arisen from a consciousness of strength, not stimulated by any temporary excitement, nor assisted by any extrinsic agency, it must have continued until the constitution should have been finally destroyed. The constitution was indeed for a time overthrown by the violence of the popular part of the government; but this violence was an occasional and unnatural excitement, and the nation returned spontaneously to the ancient and acknowledged principles of civil policy, instructed by the calamity which had been experienced in the convulsion, and guarded against its recurrence.

The popular spirit of freedom in England had been derived from that Saxon government, the laws of which served as a rallying point in the struggles with the Norman princes, until they were recognised in the great charter. The house of commons, which was afterwards constituted, had gradually acquired more and more importance, so as even before the reign of Elizabeth to be an influential

member of the government. In her reign the religious sect of the Puritans added its strength to that of the advocates of civil liberty. The political efforts of the Puritans in the parliaments of Elizabeth were however confined to the vindication of privileges, which were considered as belonging of right to the house of commons. The caution, with which in the beginning of the long parliament the views of the Puritans were disclosed, will furnish a yet more direct and conclusive evidence, that these were comparatively an inconsiderable party, acting upon a larger body, and concealing from it, as much as possible, that any further object was contemplated, than the vindication of the constitutional rights of the commons.

While the presbyterian independence and sectarian zeal of the Puritans were thus prompting the commons of England to exertions in the cause of civil liberty, for which their political importance had prepared them, though not sufficient to urge them into a direct contest with the other orders of the state, the self-conceited pedantry of James, his undisguised demand of arbitrary power, and his unsuspecting ignorance of the weakness of his pretensions, and of the inadequateness of his resources, served to provoke an insulted people to repel the encroachments of prerogative, and endeavour to erect and secure the land-marks of their liberties. Dazzled by the splendid prospect of his accession to the throne of England, his feeble mind was filled with visions of authority far superior to that, which he possessed amidst the turbulent aristocracy of a poor and narrow territory. The power which was so much greater than the dominion, which he actually exercised, appeared to him to be in its nature absolute and unlimited[1]; and that which he had so long contemplated as the right of his inheritance, seemed to him to be the indefeasible gift of heaven. It appears[2] however that the notion of the divine right of royalty had been originally suggested to James by the misfortunes of his mother. Shocked at the hostility which she had encountered, though it had placed

[1] In his speech addressed to the lords and commons in the year 1609, he entered into a detailed comparison of the uncontrolled power of kings with the attributes of the divine nature.—Harris's Life of James I., pp. 187, 188. Lond., 1772. [2] *Basilicon Doron.*

himself prematurely on the throne of his country, he was anxious to protect the royal character in his own person from similar aggressions, and loudly proclaimed a doctrine proscribing them in every imaginable case of misconduct. The celebrated Buchanan, the first modern writer[3], who sought the foundation of the royal authority in the consent of the people, had been employed to superintend the education of this prince; but, while such feelings of the past, and such anticipations of the future, occupied his mind, the instructions of this father of the Whigs could have no other influence on his political opinions, than that which the presbyteries of Scotland had on his notions of ecclesiascal government, driving him into the contrary system, and exciting him to maintain, and to extend it, with the pedantry and the violence of a controversialist. 'The great schoolmaster of the land,' as he has himself characterised a sovereign, advanced accordingly the doctrine, that kings, as vicegerents of the Deity, are accountable to him alone, and for the punishment of their crimes must be remitted to his vengeance. This doctrine became the grand maxim of his family, and their inflexible adherence to it provoked that series of struggles, by which the balance of the constitution was at length adjusted.

James appears to have proposed to himself three distinct objects in reducing to practice his conceptions of royal greatness. He was anxious to bring the English parliament to a subordination consistent with his own exorbitant pretensions of authority; he laboured to establish episcopacy on the ruin of the Scotish presbyteries; and he thought it indispensably necessary to procure for his son Charles a consort of royal extraction. A more perfect system of conduct could not have been devised for exciting the opposition of the people of England, than that which was thus blindly adopted by the folly of this vain and imprudent

[3] Laing's Hist. of Scotland, vol. i. p. 21. Lond., 1800. Bodin, a French writer, who died in the year 1596, claimed the credit of having first asserted the limitation of the power of kings; but he denied to subjects the right of resistance, allowing it only to other princes.—Bayle, art. *Bodin*. Buchanan died in the year 1582. He in the year 1579 dedicated to James his treatise *De Jure Regni apud Scotos*, which he had composed many years before.

king. His claim of arbitrary power in England offended a people, which had received from a remote antiquity, and cherished through successive ages, the spirit of a free government. His unwise attempt to alter the ecclesiastical establishment of Scotland at once alarmed the English Puritans, and prepared for them in the neighbouring country a powerful and strenuous body of auxiliaries. As if it were designed that nothing should be wanting to establish a complete separation of parties, and to alienate from the interest of his family the great majority of his subjects[4], his preposterous ambition to connect his son with the royal family of Spain, or France, engaged himself and his family in a connexion with the Roman Catholics, which disquieted his own reign, and proved the ruin of his race.

The creditable part of the government of this prince was his management of Ireland, where he was the founder of the public peace and order. When the party adverse to the English government, and eager to effect the reestablishment of the church of Rome, had been crushed in the unsuccessful struggle of the earl of Tyrone, an opportunity was afforded for constituting a contrary party, by which it might in future commotions be balanced and controlled. James accordingly, in his northern settlement of six escheated counties[5], gave a beginning to a protestant interest, which could most effectually oppose the Roman Catholics

[4] Bentivoglio at this time reported to the court of Rome, that the Roman Catholics of England were only a thirtieth part of the nation. —Decline and Fall, &c., chapter xx. note 25.

[5] Cavan, Fermanagh, Donegal, Tyrone, Armagh, and Londonderry.—Pynnar's Survey of Ulster in Harris's Hibernica, part i. 'The confiscation of Tyrone's property, and the same may be said of every confiscation in the reign of queen Elizabeth,' says Mr. Butler, 'was attended with this singular circumstance, that the crown seized not only the demesnes and seignoral right of the offender, but dispossessed all his tenants and subtenants of their lands, and parcelled them out among strangers.'—Hist. Memoir of the English, Irish, and Scotish Catholics, vol. ii. pp. 360, 361. But in Ireland, by the laws of tainistry and gavelling, no individual had any distinct and permanent property in the soil, which truly belonged to the entire clan, and was subjected to a new distribution, whenever a change occurred among the individuals, of whom a clan was composed. Nor is it true that the natives were generally dispossessed. Considerable tracts were reserved expressly for them, and we have been informed, that the fourth part of the land was not fully occupied by British settlers.—Pynnar, p. 236.

of the other provinces, while the Roman Catholic connexion, which he formed for his son, disposed these on the other hand to look to the crown for protection, and to be transformed into a party prepared to support and maintain the utmost pretensions of prerogative. From that time the province of Ulster has continued to be the most orderly and industrious part of the island, as it is at this day the acknowledged dependence of a government solicitous at the same time to conciliate the Roman Catholics. The general pacification of the country, consequent on the wars of the preceding reign, permitted him to convene the first general parliament of Ireland, which was accordingly assembled in the year 1613. For this he found it expedient to make preparation by creating forty boroughs, each sending two representatives; yet such was then the strength of the Roman Catholic interest, that the Protestants exceeded the Roman Catholic members of the house of commons only by twenty-four, the former being a hundred and twenty-five, the latter a hundred and one.

Even in his progress from Scotland to take possession of his new sovereignty, though in such a progress we might expect to find only acts of gracious conciliation, James contrived to manifest that spirit of arbitrary government[6], which strongly actuated his mind, by ordering a thief to execution without trial. He was probably admonished that such acts of power would not be tolerated in England, as he never repeated the experiment. By the unprecedented frequency of his proclamations however, not fewer than twelve having been issued within eight or nine months from his accession[7], he seemed to indicate, that these ordinances should be considered as laws. In convening his first English parliament[8] he yet more distinctly announced the extravagant opinion, which he entertained concerning the plenitude of the royal authority, for both in the writs, and in the proclamation, he took upon himself to prescribe to his people the sort of representatives, which should be returned, and required that the returns should be made to the court of chancery, where their validity should be examined and determined.

At the accession of this prince[9] some statesmen were de-

[6] Rapin, vol. ii. p. 159. [7] Ibid., pp. 162, 163. [8] Ibid.
[9] Sir Walter Raleigh, lord Cobham, sir John Fortescue, and others

sirous of binding him by specific restrictions, but were defeated by the opposition of others, who perhaps wished to recommend themselves to the new king by an unlimited confidence. The nation however was not yet ripe for such a measure. The laws of the constitution had not yet been sufficiently settled for adjusting the balance of the government; and this adjustment would probably have been less complete, if the agitations, by which it was effected, had been moderated by any previous restrictions. It is indeed extremely probable, that restrictions then imposed would have been as little regarded by James, as was the constitution of his native country, which he seized the earliest opportunity of subverting both in the church and in the state.

The king communicated to his first English parliament the plan of his policy, informing it in the speech, with which he commenced the session, that he was disposed to repress the Puritans, and to favour the Roman Catholics. Educated among the Presbyterians of his original country, he had imbibed the opinions of Calvin, and continued to maintain them as the genuine tenets of the church of England, departing from the guarded moderation of the English reformers, who had anxiously avoided these considerations. But the political principles of the Presbyterians of Scotland, had so alarmed him, that he even pronounced them to be in this respect a sect[10], which could not be tolerated in any well-governed commonwealth. For the Roman Catholics[11] he expressed on the other hand much kindness. He did indeed declare that neither could they be tolerated, so long as they should inculcate the supremacy of the Roman pontiff, and practise the assassination of excommunicated princes; but he at the same time intimated, that he had already relieved them as much as was in his power, that he meditated to procure from the parliament a favourable modification of the laws of which they were the objects, and that he earnestly wished to promote a plan of religious reconciliation. The orderly hierarchy of the church of Rome appears to have presented itself to his mind, as more suitable to the subordination of a monarchical government, than the republican

desired, that James might be bound by articles, but were opposed and overruled by Cecil, Northumberland, and others.—Harris, p. 51.

[10] Parl. Hist., vol. v. p. 29. [11] Ibid., pp. 30—32.

institutions of the Presbyterians; and he seems to have been on this account anxious to detach the Roman Catholics from the papacy, and to gain them by indulgence to the support of his own power.

How vain was this conciliatory policy of James, was evinced in the third year of his reign by the treasonable plot, by which it was designed to blow at once into the air the king, the lords, and the commons of the parliament, when assembled in their legislative character. The plot appears to have had its origin in the disappointed hopes of the Roman Catholics, who had expected from the son of Mary more than he could venture to attempt for their relief. The policy of the king was not however altered by this diabolical scheme of treachery; perhaps his timidity may have even increased his desire of conciliating a party, which had proved itself so formidable. His disposition to favour them was certainly strengthened, notwithstanding the horrible discovery, by his projects for procuring, as a consort for his son, a princess of regal extraction, first from the family of Spain, and then from that of France. Whatever influence the gunpowder-plot may have exercised on the policy of James, there can be no doubt that it served to exasperate the Puritans against the church of Rome[12], and to alienate them yet more from a sovereign willing to treat that church with indulgence.

That he might convince the Puritans of their unreasonableness in dissenting from the established church, he summoned both the parties to a conference at Hampton-Court. In his progress into England he had received from them a petition, which has been named millenary, though really subscribed by but eight hundred persons. The conference was appointed professedly for discussing the merits of this petition. In that meeting, though some attempts were made to render the doctrine of the church Calvinistical[13], the chief

[12] Hume, vol. vi. p. 12.

[13] It was proposed that to these words in the sixteenth article, 'we may depart from grace', should be added *neither totally nor finally*, which would have exactly reversed the meaning. It was also proposed that the nine articles of Lambeth should be introduced. Neal, vol. ii. p. 14. The articles of Lambeth had been framed in the year 1595, in consequence of a dissension in the university of Cambridge, which had been referred by the head of the university to the arbitration of the archbishop and some other di-

objections were urged against its ceremonies and its discipline. James conceded to the Puritans some minute corrections of the liturgy[14], which he ordained by proclamation; but he rejected all their pretensions in very decisive language.

An occasion was at this time afforded for the formation of a sect, which afterwards so much exceeded the Presbyterians in their most violent measures of resistance, that it served to drive them back within the limits of the constitution. A book of canons had been prepared, and had been ratified by the convocation[15], which denounced the penalties of excommunication against all, who should in any particular deviate from the most strict conformity. Though it was soon dis-

vines. They maintained the doctrine of Calvin in its most rigorous form. The queen signified to the archbishop her displeasure at his conduct in permitting the discussion, and commanded that the articles should not be publicly urged.—Ibid., vol. i. pp. 497—499.

[14] These were 'the expounding of the word *absolution by remission of sins*, the qualifying of the rubric about private baptism, the adding of some thanksgivings at the end of the litany, and answers at the close of the catechism.'—Heylyn's Hist. of the Presbyterians, p. 373. Oxford, 1670. James however also consented to a new translation of the bible, provided that it should have no marginal notes, alleging that the translation of Geneva was the worst, as the marginal notes allowed disobedience to kings.—Neal, vol. ii. p. 15. This, which is still used, was published in the year 1611. For executing it fifty-four persons were selected from the two universities. Some of these having died soon afterwards, the work was undertaken by forty-seven, who were divided into six companies, each of which undertook a distinct portion. Among the regulations prescribed to them it was directed, that they should adhere as closely as possible to the translation named 'the Bishop's Bible,' which was a revision of that of Cranmer, and had been prepared for the purpose of setting aside that of Geneva.—Neal, vol. i. pp. 222, 223; vol. ii. p. 89. The Bishop's Bible had been published in the year 1568, and was so named because eight of the persons employed in preparing it were bishops.

[15] Of these canons, as they have never been confirmed in parliament, it has been solemnly adjudged, that, where they are not merely declaratory of the ancient canon law, but are introductory of new regulations, they do not bind the laity, whatever regard the clergy may think proper to pay them.—Blackstone's Com., introd., sect. 3. James notwithstanding caused them to be executed generally, as if they were a part of the law of the land. They were collected out of the injunctions and other episcopal and synodical acts of the reigns of Edward VI. and Elizabeth.—Neal, vol. ii. p. 32. The penalty of excommunication was at this time substituted for others less severe.—Ibid., p. 34.

covered to be impracticable to enforce the rigorous observance of these ordinances, as the church would have been deprived of too many of its ministers, they had yet the effect of giving occasion to a new separation, which generated the Independents. Many ministers having fled for refuge to the Dutch provinces, a church was there formed by an Englishman, named Brown[16], in which each congregation professed to be itself a church distinct from all other in ecclesiastical government. From that country the sect was in the year 1616 introduced into England, where, besides taking a principal part in the colonisation of North America, it decided the fortune of the civil war. As they who had fled from Mary, found in the ecclesiastical republic of Geneva a suitable receptacle for forming the habits of Presbyterians, so the refugees of the reign of James were enabled, under the general tolerance of a commercial government, to arrange the system of the Independents.

The first parliament of James very soon, and very perseveringly, exhibited a spirit of freedom, which interfered with his purpose of employing it only as an instrument of his own authority. Immediately after the hereditary right of the king had been acknowledged by a parliamentary act, it was agreed that a conference of the two houses should be held on the state of the nation[17], particularly in regard to purveyorship, respite of homage, and wardship, all confessedly belonging to the ancient prerogative of the crown. The commons at the same time resisted with firmness an attempt of the king[18], to carry into execution his plan of controlling

[16] From him they were named Brownists. Brown first published his opinions in Norwich in the year 1580. In the year 1592 it was said by Sir Walter Raleigh in parliament, that he feared that there were in England of his sect nearly twenty thousand men, besides women and children.—Hist. of Dissenters by Bogue and Bennett, vol. i. p. 130. London, 1808. [17] Parl. Hist., vol. v. p. 55. [18] Sir Francis Goodwin, who had been elected representative of Buckinghamshire, was rejected by the clerk of the crown as an outlaw, agreeably to a direction, which James had given in his proclamation, and Sir James Fortescue was elected under a second writ. The house of commons however immediately confirmed the election of Sir Francis Goodwin, and afterwards refused to hold a conference with the lords on the question; and, though they submitted to defend their proceeding before the king, they resolved that they would not hold a conference with the judges, except in the presence of his majesty. It was finally deter-

the election of their members. In the succeeding year the parliament extended its statement of grievances to other particulars of the feudal tenures[19], proposing to compensate the crown for the relinquishment of all these prerogatives. In the third[20] so great anxiety to discover grievances was manifested, that the king remarked, that the commons had sent a crier through the nation to find them. In the seventh the commons complained of two books recently published[21], which inculcated the most slavish principles of policy. One of these, named the Interpreter, written by doctor Covel, exalted the power of the sovereign above all limitation; the other, written by doctor Blackwood, went perhaps further, for it taught that the English were all actually slaves from the Norman conquest. A prosecution which had been commenced against the former of these writers, was discontinued on account of the interposition of the king, who had before been understood to have given commendation to his treatise.

This parliament at length agreed to allow the annual sum of two hundred thousand pounds required by the king[22], in return for the concessions, which they had solicited; but James had become so impatient of its inquisitive spirit, that, relinquishing the arrangement, he abruptly dissolved it in the year 1610. Its vigilance however was sufficiently justified, the king having in its commencement attempted to control the elections of the commons, in which struggle he issued an order professedly 'as an absolute king[23],' and having afterwards protected and countenanced a writer, whose principles were destructive of freedom.

When the first parliament had been thus dissolved, it was determined to conduct the government without the inconvenient restraint of such an assembly, and more than three years elapsed, before the thoughtless profusion of James had exhausted the various expedients[24], by which he endeavoured

mined, with the concurrence of Sir Francis Goodwin, that there should be a new election. Sir Francis Goodwin was however soon afterwards elected for the town of Buckingham.—Parl. Hist., vol. v. pp. 58—87.

[19] Ibid., p. 103. [20] Ibid., p. 154. [21] Ibid., pp. 221—225.

[22] Ibid., pp. 264—268. [23] Ibid., p. 81. [24] How he defrayed at this time the expenses of his government is, says the compiler of the Parliamentary History, a secret. Some expedients however have been specified. The king claimed an aid of his subjects, when he gave his

to compensate the loss of parliamentary supplies. A parliament assembled in such circumstances being necessarily less favourable than the preceding, the commons proceeded immediately to the consideration of the manner[25], in which money had in the interval been levied upon the people. The king, on the other hand, indignant at the investigation of the commons, dissolved the parliament after a short session, and imprisoned several of the members[26].

The second parliament having been dismissed, the king was again necessitated to have recourse to the most irregular methods of providing money[27]. These however were insufficient to defray the expenses of an armament sent to the relief of the elector palatine, who had married his daughter,

daughter Elizabeth in marriage to the elector palatine, in the year 1612. Under the pretext of planting colonies in the north of Ireland he instituted the order of baronets, who, to the number of two hundred, should pay for this dignity each a thousand pounds. He raised the price of English coined gold two shillings in the pound, bringing it, as was alleged, to the value at which it was received in foreign countries. Lastly, a lottery was drawn, the professed purpose of which was to plant English colonies in Virginia, but it may have been applied to the general use of the government.—Parl. Hist., vol. v. pp. 270—272. The ordinary resources of the crown consisted in the crown-lands, the customs, wardships, purveyances, &c.—Hume, vol. vi. p. 190. A particular account has been published of James's revenue during the first fourteen years of his reign, from which it appears that his ordinary income did not exceed four hundred and fifty thousand eight hundred and sixty-three pounds, and that his ordinary disbursements exceeded his permanent income by thirty-six thousand six hundred and seventeen pounds yearly. In the year 1610 lord Salisbury declared in parliament that the king was burdened with a debt of three hundred thousand pounds.—Sinclair's Hist. of the Revenue, vol. i. p. 244. [25] Parl. Hist., vol. v. p. 287. [26] Rapin, vol. ii. p. 186. [27] These appear to have consisted in exacting fifty-two thousand nine hundred and nine pounds from the citizens of London, in giving up to the Dutch for a sum of money the cautionary towns, and in receiving money for dispensations from penal statutes, for licensing inns, for a monopoly of gold and silver thread, and for grants of concealments. By concealments seem to have been signified lands of ecclesiastical and charitable institutions possessed without authority by individuals.—Ibid. pp. 307—345. The Dutch provinces had been indebted to Elizabeth to the amount of eight hundred thousand pounds. Of this sum James had already received two hundred thousand pounds; and at this time he relinquished for a sum of two hundred and fifty thousand the towns, which had been given to Elizabeth as a security of the debt.—Sinclair, vol i. pp. 242, 243.

and was then involved in the great struggle of the German empire; and therefore, as the war was popular among the people of England, having been undertaken in support of the Protestants of Germany, he ventured, after an interruption of nearly six years, to try whether he might not then find a parliament more disposed to supply his wants.

The third parliament of this reign, assembled in the year 1620, is memorable for a protestation[28], in which the commons asserted their privileges to be the right of their inheritance, in opposition to the pretension of the king, who professed to consider them as revocable at his pleasure. As this parliament resolved to begin with the consideration of the public grievances[29], postponing that of the supply, for which it had been convened, it was first occupied about the due execution of the laws against popish recusants, and the prosecution of delinquencies in the cases of patents and monopolies. The necessities of the state were not however neglected, a supply being granted sufficient for the present urgency of the occasion[30]. The commons then proceeded to impeach the lord chancellor, the celebrated Bacon, whose genius has formed an epoch in the history of knowledge, but whose misconduct in his high office has also exhibited a lamentable example of the weakness of the noblest mind.

The king appears to have willingly concurred with this parliament in abolishing obnoxious patents[31], and in punishing those persons, who had injured the interests of the nation. There was however a subject, in regard to which they could not come to an agreement. The growth of popery, rendered more alarming by the negotiation for a marriage between the heir of the British crown and the infanta of Spain, called forth a remonstrance from the commons, which committed them in a direct struggle with the sovereign. James, who had heard of the intended remonstrance[32], anticipated it by addressing to the speaker a letter, in which he

[28] Rapin, vol. ii. p. 204. It is also memorable for the first concerted opposition party in the house of commons. "Such a combination was so novel, that we shall see that the king's minister commenced a prosecution against its leaders for an illegal cabal; and to escape detection, the oppositionists resorted to the place of rendezvous with disguised faces." Johnson's Life of Selden, p. 30. London, 1835. [29] Parl. Hist., vol. v. p. 333. [30] Ibid., p. 349. [31] Ibid., pp. 387, 475.
[32] Parl. Hist., vol. v. pp. 491, 492, 496, 512.

forbade the house to intermeddle with affairs of state, and particularly with the marriage of his son. The commons immediately prepared a second remonstrance, requesting that the former, sent at the same time, might be received, and claiming a liberty of discussion, which the letter of the king had threatened to restrain. This second remonstrance was answered by the king with an intimation, that the privileges of the commons had been derived from the favour of the crown, and should be retrenched, if any encroachment were made on the royal prerogative. After a week, when the commons had shewn no disposition to proceed in the business of a supply, the parliament was adjourned by the king, but not before the commons had prepared a protestation, in which they asserted, that their parliamentary privileges were the birth-right of the people of England, and that all the arduous affairs of the government were proper subjects of deliberation for their assembly[33]. The king, irritated at this declaration, sent for the journal of the commons, and with his own hand tore it from the book[34]. He then published a dissolution by proclamation, stating several reasons, on account of which he had recourse to the measure. The dissolution was followed by the arbitrary and offensive proceeding of committing to prison those members of the house of commons, who had been most forward in opposing the court, in addition to one who had been imprisoned during the session, though professedly not for his conduct in parliament. Other members of the opposition were sent in a commission to Ireland, as a lighter punishment; one was in the like manner despatched to the palatinate; one, by a policy become familiar in modern times, was taken into favour, and promoted by the king.

Two years after this third dissolution, when an attempt had been unsuccessfully made to procure money by a voluntary contribution[35], and the expected failure of the negotiation for the marriage with the Spanish infanta promised to remove the impediment obstructing the agreement of the king

[33] The king contended that the word *quibusdam*, prefixed to the words *arduis regni* in the writ for assembling the parliament, limited the subjects of deliberation to those cases, in regard to which he might choose to consult them. Ibid., p. 516. [34] Ibid. [35] Parl. Hist., vol. v. pp. 527—529.

and his people, a fourth parliament was assembled. The king was at this time reduced to the necessity of soliciting the advice of the parliament, and of proposing that the supply[36], to be granted for a war with Austria, should be expended by persons selected by the two houses. The constitution had not yet established the responsibility of ministers[37], by which the expenditure of the public money is now controlled, though intrusted to persons appointed by the sovereign. The only method therefore of controlling it, which then occurred, was to commit to the two houses the nomination of the persons to be employed. James however still required[38], that he should have a secret council of war, for determining the military purposes, to which the expenditure should be applied.

The increasing power of the commons was manifested in this last parliament by the successful impeachment of the lord treasurer Middlesex, whom the king in vain endeavoured to protect. This impeachment having been instigated by the duke of Buckingham and the prince, afterwards the unfortunate Charles I., the king admonished the latter[39], that he would live to have enough of parliamentary impeachments, a prediction abundantly verified.

In this review of the conduct of James towards his several parliaments, we observe the overweening vanity of the king offending his people by advancing pretensions incompatible with their ancient and hereditary rights; but the grand cause of dissension was that he imprudently connected himself with the Roman Catholics in opposition to the prevailing sentiment of the nation, and particularly to the principles of the growing party of the Puritans. In his anxiety to secure his succession to the throne of England, he had endeavoured to conciliate the Roman Catholics of that country by assurances of protection, which he afterwards actually afforded to all except the more rigid members of that church, who, in opposition to his own favourite notions of his absolute authority, maintained the supremacy of the Roman

[36] Parl. Hist., vol. vi. p. 95. [37] The king, addressing the lords in the year 1624 concerning lord Middlesex, said, 'there are divers things laid to his charge, which were done with my knowledge and approbation; let him bear no charge for that, for that is mine, and I must bear it.'—Ibid., p. 195. [38] Ibid., p. 110. [39] Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 23. Oxford, 1717.

pontiff. Even these he was little disposed to prosecute after the discovery of the plot[40], which they had formed for the destruction of himself and the parliament, in revenge for the disappointment of their too sanguine expectations. But he was much more deeply involved in obnoxious indulgences to the Roman Catholics by his protracted negotiations for the marriage of his son. It happened that there was not then any protestant princess of royal extraction, and the vanity of James would not suffer him to think of an inferior alliance. Anxious to procure for his son a consort suitable to his rank, he engaged in a matrimonial negotiation with the court of Spain; and, when this had been abandoned through the influence of the duke of Buckingham[41], another was speedily commenced with the court of France, on terms yet more favourable to the Roman Catholics[42], than had in the former case been required. The family of the Stuarts was thus, by the policy and timidity and vanity of the first of these princes, engaged in a connexion with a party, which afterwards bore its part in the civil war, and subsequently urged forward the revolution.

The circumstances of the Scotish parliament afforded James a more favourable opportunity for asserting that unlimited prerogative, to which he was so much attached. The commons[43], recently augmented in number and importance by the introduction of representatives of the lesser barons, adhered to the crown through jealousy of the nobles: the prelates, who had been recalled to their places in the parliament, though indigent and destitute of authority in the church, were at this time increased to the number of ten, all dependent on the king for protection and the hope of future aggrandisement: the lords of *erections*, or of monastic benefices secularised, were attached to James by gratitude for the favours already received, or by the fear of a revocation: the Roman Catholic lords looked to him for protection against the Presbyterians; and the nobility in general, unaccustomed to resist their sovereign except in the field, were more disposed to participate his bounty, than to engage in a parliamentary warfare against his claims. The king was accordingly gratified with a declara-

[40] Harris, p. 220. [41] Welwood's Memoirs, p. 65. Dublin, 1752.
[42] Rapin, vol. ii. p. 235. [43] Laing's Hist. of Scotland, vol. i. pp. 30, 31.

tion of his absolute authority, and with a previous abolition of any future statute, which might derogate from his supreme dominion.

The influence of the king was soon afterwards employed in procuring for his authority the support of a well-established episcopacy. Though, before his accession to the throne of England[44], he had in very strong terms declared his preference of the Scotish church, the great object of his subsequent government of his native country was to reduce that church to a conformity with the episcopal establishment of his new kingdom, as much more favourable to his pretension of unlimited power. In this scheme he was to a considerable degree successful, having at length, after various efforts, prevailed to restore to the episcopal order of Scotland a small portion of its former revenues[45], with almost the whole of its ecclesiastical authority. The form of worship however was less manageable, and it was with the utmost difficulty[46], and when an assurance had been given that no further innovation should be proposed, that five articles of conformity[47] with the more ceremonious worship of the English church were at length adopted. But concessions thus wrested from the Scots served only to excite a reaction against the power so odiously exerted. A gloomy fanaticism pervaded the nation, which in the succeeding reign engendered the celebrated covenant, a reciprocal device for reducing the episcopal church of England to the presbyterian model.

Though in Ireland James was the founder of the public peace and order, yet from one great measure of general improvement, by which the yeomanry of Ireland were emancipated from the dominion of the chiefs, and received into the immediate protection of the crown, has been derived that influence of the court of Rome[48] in the appointment

[44] Rapin, vol. ii. p. 236. [45] Laing, vol. i. pp. 38, 39, 58—61.

[46] Ibid., p. 82. [47] 1. That the eucharist should be received in a kneeling posture; 2. that in extreme sickness it should be administered in private; 3. that baptism should be privately administered, if necessary; 4. that episcopal confirmation should be bestowed upon youth; 5. that the descent of the Spirit, with the birth, passion, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus Christ, should be commemorated annually in the church.—Ibid., p. 71. [48] Columbanus ad Hibernos, n. 2, p. xlviii—l, by C. O'Conor.

of the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland, which has cherished the alienation of the laity from the government of the country. The native Irish respected James as a rightful king of Ireland[49], being descended from Edward Bruce, brother of Robert king of Scotland, who in the beginning of the fourteenth century had been elected and crowned king by their ancestors. The chiefs accordingly from his accession were generally well affected to the state, and might have retained the lower orders in obedience; but, separated as these were by this measure from the authority of their ancient leaders, they were exposed to the artful representations of those, who laboured to establish among them a system of foreign influence[50]. This influence within our own time seems to have ceased to operate, but the spirit, which it formed, subsists in all its vigour.

While James, in laying the foundation of the substantial improvement of the country, was by one measure unintentionally exposing the Roman Catholics to the influence of Rome, he by another, with as little design, prepared a puritanical interest, by which they were opposed and overpowered in the struggle of the succeeding reign. The difficulty of inducing Englishmen to migrate to the new settlement[51], and the vicinity of Scotland, caused a large proportion of the settlers to be natives of North-Britain, who brought with them the worship and discipline of the presbyterian church. Even the bishops of the settlement were Scots, except the bishop of Derry, who was an Englishman, this county being occupied by a colony of English.

The principles of puritanism, thus introduced in the original formation of the great settlement of Protestants of

[49] Mac-Geoghegan, tome iii. p. 637. [50] 'Little known in the reign of Edward II., disregarded in that of Henry VIII., the sovereignty of the holy see became thenceforward more popular, until, in the times of the first James and the first Charles, it was at length incorporated into the religious belief of the country. Some of the credit of this achievement may be claimed for the industry of the Jesuit missionaries; but the true solution is, that the antipathy to England, which had hitherto opposed, was now the advocate of the papal claims, and the bull of Adrian proved more powerful as an incentive to rebellion, than it had ever been as an argument for loyalty.' —Doctor Phelan's Hist. of the Policy of the Church of Rome in Ireland, pp. 14, 15. [51] Leland, vol. ii. p. 430.

Ireland, were favoured by various appointments in the university and in the church. The first provost of the university, after the honorary appointment of archbishop Loftus, was Walter Travers, whose puritanical opposition to the celebrated Hooker[52], then master of the Temple, gave occasion to the composition of the Ecclesiastical Polity. The two succeeding provosts were also Puritans, and provost Bedell, afterwards bishop of Kilmore, who was next appointed, was decidedly Calvinistical in his notions of religion, though strict in conforming to the established ritual. The distinction[53], which doctor James Usher had acquired by his abilities and learning, caused him to be selected for the important task of framing a confession of faith for the Irish church, though to introduce that already established in England was a more obvious expedient. Usher, who was strongly prepossessed in favour of the opinions of Calvin, availed himself of the opportunity for propagating them, and accordingly prepared a series of one hundred and four articles, including almost literally those which had been framed at Lambeth, though disapproved both by Elizabeth and James. The convocation adopted this confession, and it obtained the ratification of the lord deputy. In the succeeding reign these articles were laid aside[54], and those of the church of England substituted for them; but, as they had continued during nineteen years to form the public confession of the Irish church, they had

[52] Life of Hooker, prefixed to his Eccles. Polity, p. 19. Lond. 1666. [53] Leland, vol. ii. pp. 458, 459. [54] This change, which was much facilitated by the quiet and yielding temper of the primate, was effected in the year 1634, though almost all the clergy favoured the rejected articles. The presbyterian clergy of the north, who had been admitted to officiate as parochial ministers, the bishops assisting at their ordinations as presbyters, were deprived of their benefices by Henry Cromwell, when lord lieutenant, for refusing to swear the oath of submission to the protector. The ejected ministers received at the restoration an annuity of five hundred pounds, which in the year 1690 was augmented to twelve hundred by William; and Anne added a further annuity of eight hundred for the dissenting ministers in the south.—Hist. of Dissenters, vol. ii. pp. 411—419. The annual stipend, or *regium donum*, now given to the ministers of the synod of Ulster, exceeds fifteen thousand pounds, exclusively of other sums allowed for the ministers of the Presbyterians of the south, and for those of the seceding congregations.

had sufficient opportunity for making a lasting impression on the spirit and conduct of the established clergy.

It has been observed of this prince[55], that, from the discovery of the gunpowder-plot, he continued always writing and talking against popery, but acting for it. An inconsistency at least equal to this may be remarked in his conduct towards those, who maintained the doctrine of Calvin. In the year 1615, he authorised in Ireland the adoption of Calvinistical articles[56]; in England he sent in the very next year instructions to Oxford for suppressing the authority of Calvin in that university; in the year 1618 he sent deputies to the synod of Dort, to support the Calvinists against the Arminians; and again, in the year 1622, he directed that no preachers below the rank of dignitaries should be permitted to preach on the doctrines held by the former. Vacillating because weak, he was at different times, and in different cases, actuated by contrary motives, though that, which he denominated king-craft, was generally predominant. It is obvious that no character could be more fitted to excite the activity of all parties, than that which afforded them encouragement so inconsistent.

It was a favourite object with James to form in the western province of Ireland a plantation similar to that, which he had effected in the north. But in this scheme he was not assisted by circumstances equally favourable, especially as no abortive efforts of insurrection[57] had invested him with

[55] Burnet's Hist. of His Own Time, vol. i. p. 9. [56] Heylyn thought it probable that he had been induced to sanction these articles by the following motives: 1. that he was then much influenced in ecclesiastical affairs by Abbot archbishop of Canterbury, and the bishop of Bath and Wells; 2. that he had supported the prince of Orange against the Dutch Arminians; 3. that the extreme doctrine of Calvinism might best be opposed to the errors of Rome, which were prevalent in Ireland; and 4. that it was good policy to balance the Puritans against the Papists.—Hist. of the Presbyterians, p. 394. [57] The northern counties had been escheated in consequence of the flight of the earls of Tyrone and Tyrconnell, whose scheme of rebellion had been accidentally discovered, and of the suppression of the actual rebellion of Sir Cahir O'Dogherty, the proprietor of the peninsula of Innisowen and the adjacent district. Mac-Geoghegan has represented this rebellion as a contrivance of St. Laurence, baron of Howth, to implicate the Irish chieftains in a plot against the state, for the purpose of procuring a confiscation of their lands, which was countenanced by the flight of the two earls, suggested with the same view.—Hist. de l'Irlande, tome iii. p.

an unequivocal right of disposing of the land at his pleasure. The lords and gentlemen of Connaught had on the contrary surrendered their estates to Elizabeth[58], that they might be confirmed in their possession of them by grants from the crown; and, though they had generally neglected the necessary formalities, yet James himself had issued a commission for supplying the deficiency, and, the surrenders having been again made, the patents of confirmation had passed the great seal. Having thus completed the transaction, James was manifestly precluded from interfering with the property of the province. In his eager desire however of extending the improvement of Ireland, and at the same time of providing for the deficiencies of the public revenue, he resolved to avail himself of the neglect of his own officers, in omitting to enrol the surrenders and patents, though three thousand pounds had been disbursed for that purpose. The proprietors determined to divert the king from his project by supplying his necessities, and a treaty was begun for adjusting the terms of the agreement; but the negotiation was interrupted by the death of James, and the question of a western plantation was left to be an important principle of dissension in the succeeding reign.

Such were the measures of this prince, whom his contemporary Henry IV. of France in derision denominated 'captain of arts and clerk of arms[59].' All his pretensions and exertions only prepared the agencies of that struggle, in which his son and successor was afterwards overthrown. The spirit of civil liberty was by his open claim of power trained to jealousy and resistance; the sectarian zeal of the Puritans of England was by his condemnation of their principles excited to increased activity; the Presbyterians of Scotland, irritated by a compulsory establishment of episcopacy, were predisposed to their subsequent attempt to force their own ecclesiastical system on the English nation; the Roman Catholics of England were encouraged by his negotiations

642. This account has however been refuted by Leland, vol. ii. pp. 423, 424. It may be added, that the act of attainder was moved in the house of commons by Sir John Everard, a recusant, who had been strongly supported by the Roman Catholics in a competition with Sir John Davies for the office of speaker.—Ibid., pp. 447—456.

[58] Leland, vol. ii. pp. 477, 478. [59] Sully's Mem., vol. iii. p. 234.

for the marriage of his son with a princess of their church; and in Ireland, where his government appears in the fairest view, and was really productive of important and lasting benefits, he formed a religious interest, which attached itself to the adversaries of his son.

It is well known that the history of Hume is a laboured apology of the government of the Stuarts, representing it as but a continued enforcement of principles already established and acknowledged[60], which then only began to be questioned, as the puritanical party was rising into importance. But even the princes of the house of Tudor[61], though they raised the prerogative higher than the earlier sovereigns of England, never ventured to assume the direct power of taxation, nor to conduct the government during any long period without the assistance of a parliament. Still less did they openly assert, as the first of these princes did[62], that, as to dispute what God may do is blasphemy, so is it sedition in subjects to dispute what a king may do in the height of his power. And, though it were strictly true, as the historian has stated[63], that the genius of the ancient government allowed scattered instances of such a kind, as would have been totally destructive of the constitution, had they been continued without interruption, yet is there an important distinction between the occasional occurrence of acts of power, and a persevering and systematic exercise of prerogatives inconsistent with the very forms of a mixed government. The historian has indeed represented the utter inability of James I. to support his pretensions by military power[64], as affording a strong presumption, that they were at least built on what were then deemed plausible arguments; and it is certain that he seemed to think, that he could lecture the nation into a submission

[60] Of the inaccuracy of the narrative of this historian an example may be taken from Dalrymple's Memorials of James I., p. 24. Glasgow, 1766. 'In this session, 1610, the commons,' says the historian, 'contented themselves with remonstrating against the proceedings of the high-commission court.' It appears however from that writer, that they again passed a bill, which had been rejected in the last, and in the next preceding session, for restraining the execution of ecclesiastical canons not confirmed by the parliament. [61] Millar's Hist. View of the English Gov., vol. iii. p. 317. [62] King James's Works, pp. 529—531. Lond. 1616. [63] Hist. of England, vol. vi. p. 181, note. [64] Ibid., p. 197.

to his claims. But, though it was most fortunate for the liberty of these countries, that the claims of arbitrary power were urged by a prince so incapable of enforcing them by arms, the folly of the attempt, in the case of one, who, with a very confined understanding, was vain of his scholastic acquirements, and averse from military enterprises[65], furnishes a very feeble presumption in his favour.

Though James, in his anxiety to procure for his son a consort of royal extraction, involved himself in connexions with the Roman Catholic governments of Spain and France, he married his daughter to a protestant prince, the elector palatine. It is remarkable that, as by the marriage of his son the combination of interests was begun, which ultimately caused the expulsion of his family from the throne, so was that of his daughter the origin of the claim of succession[66], which after a century established the family of Hanover in its room. So comprehensive are the arrangements, which present themselves to our observation in a philosophical analysis of the moral government of the world, and so much does their prospective character exceed the anticipations of the politician.

The reign of James, which was thus interesting in regard to the development of the political and ecclesiastical parties of the state, claims attention also in another view, as it was illustrated by the genius of Bacon, the creator of the modern philosophy of experiment. Looking round with a piercing glance at the whole compass of the knowledge of his age, he discovered that the powers of the intellect had been little successful, because they had been ill directed; and he pointed to the track, in which Newton afterwards penetrated to the greater mysteries of the universe, and Davy has since detected its more subtle wonders. He was not a mathematician like Kepler[67], nor like Galileo an observer and an expe-

[65] He took pleasure in describing himself as a pacific king. His habitual dislike of arms has been ascribed to the shock experienced by his mother at the murder of Rizzio, at which time she was pregnant of this prince. [66] The princess Sophia, daughter of this marriage, became the wife of Ernest Augustus, the first elector of Hanover, and her son became king of England by the title of George I., precisely a century after the marriage of the daughter of James. [67] Apparently influenced by a partiality towards the learning of the continent, Hume has represented Bacon, the father of English philosophy, as inferior to

rimenter; but he was in the most enlarged sense of the word a philosopher, for he directed such men as these in the discovery of truth, and his method of inductive reasoning from scientific experiment has indefinitely extended the intellectual dominion of his species[68].

While we admire the pre-eminent genius, which could guide future ages in the search of truth, it may be useful to reflect on those basenesses of conduct, which have demonstrated, that moral rectitude is not necessarily connected with the highest intellectual excellence. It is also interesting to remark, that the moral unworthiness of this extraordinary man has been instrumental to the improvement of our judicial system, by giving occasion to the first appeals from that court of chancery, which in his adulation he had represented to James as 'the court of his absolute power[69].'

Kepler and Galileo. But these eminent men improved the knowledge of their contemporaries only by their own actual discoveries, and by the example of their success, whereas Bacon has pointed out with precision the track, in which all later philosophers might advance with security in the investigation of truth, and in which they are still continuing to advance. [68] The characteristic excellence of Bacon's inductive reasoning consists in this, that the enquirer proceeds by experiments so contrived, as to exclude the agency of all other causes than that which is the object of enquiry. With this view he suggested the ingenious and encouraging remark, that a negative or unsuccessful experiment, is more instructive than one, in which an expected result is obtained, because it indicates that a supposed cause does not operate, and thereby narrows the investigation. The investigation of final causes he proscribed. because it had been inconveniently blended with that of the efficient causes of natural operations. But this is truly an investigation of effects, as the other is of causes, and consequently belongs as properly to the philosophy of nature. The number of the department of natural philosophy has accordingly, since the time of Bacon, been increased by the addition of physiology, which investigates the functions of the several parts of the structure of organised bodies. [69] Blackstone's Comm., book iii. ch. 27.

CHAPTER XV.

Of the history of Great Britain and Ireland, from the accession of Charles I. in the year 1625, *to the commencement of the civil war in the year* 1642.

Charles I. king in the year 1625—Petition of right, 1628—Canons introduced into Scotland, 1636—Liturgy introduced there, 1637—The Scotish covenant, 1638—First invasion of the Scots, 1640—Irish rebellion, 1641—Bishops excluded from parliament in England, the civil war begun in England, and general assembly of Roman Catholics in Ireland, 1642.

For effecting that adjustment of the British constitution which the philosophic Tacitus had pronounced to be unattainable [1], it appears to have been necessary, that the people and the sovereign should alternately prevail, so that the experience of the contrary excesses of democracy and despotism might dispose the minds of men to rest in some intermediate position of reasonable and regulated freedom. This alternation however could scarcely have occurred, if principles of freedom had not been already formed and settled in the government, which, like the force of gravity in matter, could draw back the pendulous and unsteady constitution from its aberrations. The excesses of democracy would probably have produced their usual and natural result, in establishing a despotism, and the expectation of the Roman historian would thus have been justified by the event. It appears that he had not been able to collect from the ill-constructed governments of Greece and Rome, what might be the influence of acknowledged principles of equal right in endearing to a people the recollection of ancient institutions, and recalling it from political excesses. These governments, however fitted to draw forth the energies of the human mind, were by no means favourable to public order and security. Their struggles had never any retrospect to former institutions, by which the people might be guided as by the landmarks of their liberty, but tended only to establish the

[1] Cunctas nationes et urbes populus, aut primores, aut singuli regunt: delecta ex his et constituta republicæ forma laudari facilius quam evenire, vel, si evenit, haud diuturna esse potest.—Annal., lib. iv., cap. 33.

dominion of one party over another: and the result was uniformly such, as in the mind of a reflecting politician, would forbid the expectation, that an orderly adjustment of opposing interests could be effected, or, if effected, could be long preserved.

Even by this consideration, derived from the general philosophy of government, the principle may be refuted which, Hume has been anxious to establish for the vindication of the Stuarts, that maxims of civil liberty began at this period, for the first time, to be maintained in the English parliament. If the nation had no acknowledged rights to be maintained, the adjustment, which was finally effected, could never have been accomplished, or at least so as to be permanent, because no force would have acted to restrain the excess of each prevailing party, and reduce both to moderation. It was, on the contrary, because the commons had acknowledged rights, that the Puritans, at first an inconsiderable party, were able to excite a large portion of the people, to oppose the encroachments of the royal power; as it was afterwards the operation of the same cause, which, when this opposition had overthrown the ancient government, re-established it after a few years, to experience in turn the extravagances of the other party, which were also in the like manner to be controlled.

It is certain indeed that the commons of England were affected by those causes[2], which were then in most parts of Europe, though in very different degrees, raising that order of men to a higher rank of political importance; and it is also certain that the introduction of the puritanical spirit among the English, through the affinity naturally existing between religious and civil independence, had furnished a very powerful stimulant to exertion in the cause of freedom. The people might by these influences have been disposed to require some concessions of that prerogative, which had been so magnified by the princes of the house of Tudor; but no

[2] It has been said by Sanderson, in his Life of Charles I., that the members of the house of commons, in the third parliament of that king, were so rich, that they were able to buy the house of lords three times over. This, though probably an hyperbole, yet is sufficient to show, to what a height of riches the commons of England were arrived in those days.—Parl. Hist., vol. vii. p. 359.

reason appears for believing that, if the ancient principles of the constitution had been respected by the government, the commons could have been then induced to engage in any measure hostile to the crown. But the two earlier princes of the family of Stuart were precisely fitted to provoke a people so circumstanced into a struggle for superiority. The vanity and pedantry of James most unwisely challenged the discussion of the great question of the government; and the inflexible obstinacy and evasive insincerity of his son completed[3], what the weakness of the father had commenced, leading on the opposition through every gradation of legitimate resistance, faction, usurpation, and anarchy, to that fatal extremity of bringing the sovereign to the scaffold, and annihilating the monarchy.

The marriage of the daughter of James has been noticed, as having given being to the race, by which his direct posterity has been superseded on the British throne. The influence of that marriage was not however confined to this remote operation, for the war, in which it involved his son, proved the cause of those pecuniary embarrassments, which alternately drove him to the parliament for relief, and at other times determined him to seek in arbitrary expedients the means of his deliverance. James had declined to maintain the cause of his son-in-law the elector palatine, not merely

[3] 'There are two circumstances in his character,' says Hume, vol. vi. p. 247, 'seemingly incompatible, which attended him during his whole reign, and were the chief cause of all his misfortunes: he was very steady and even obstinate in his purpose; and was easily governed, by reason of his facility, and of his deference to men much inferior to himself in morals and understanding. His great ends he inflexibly maintained; but the means of attaining them he readily received from his ministers and favourites, though not always fortunate in his choice.' This obstinacy was remarkably exemplified in the inflexibility, with which he refused to accede to the treaty of Uxbridge.—Welwood's Memoirs, p. 55. The historian has also acknowledged, in the original edition of his history, that Charles was too apt, in imitation of his father, to consider the promises, which he made to the parliament, as temporary expedients, which after the dissolution of the parliament he was not any farther to regard.—Hist. of Great Britain, p. 156, quoted in Harris's Life of Charles I., p. 75. Lond., 1772. This passage has been much softened in succeeding editions of the history. The king by his own express command levied tonnage and poundage without the authority of parliament, though all such exactions had been explicitly relinquished in the consent, which he had given to the Petition of Right.

through aversion for war, but also because he deemed so highly of the royal character, that he would not support him in his attempt to possess himself of the throne of Bohemia, and for the restoration of the Palatinate, from which he had been expelled, the king trusted to his negotiations with the court of Spain. Charles was however disposed to assist his brother-in-law with vigour, and in the inevitable expenses of the enterprise he found the occasion of all his difficulties. As these difficulties rendered it impracticable for this prince to persist in his arbitrary plan of governing without a parliament, we may trace to the war of Germany the preservation of our constitutional liberty in this crisis of its history, so that the same great contest of the continental powers, which in the peace of Westphalia adjusted the general interests of the European system, extended its operation to the domestic concerns of the British government, rescuing its freedom from the grasp of arbitrary power.

Engaged in a contest demanding extraordinary supplies, Charles addressed his first parliament with confidence, expecting that a war undertaken for the support of a protestant prince, would be popular with his subjects. In this expectation he might not have been disappointed, if numerous causes had not alienated them from him. The jealousy already excited by the pretensions and measures of his father[4]; the hatred of the duke of Buckingham, the minister and favourite of Charles, as he had before been of James; the recent marriage of the king with a princess of France, to whose religion extraordinary indulgence had been in consequence conceded; a suspicion of the disposition of bishop Laud[5], the adviser of the king in ecclesiastical affairs, to

[4] Rapin, vol. ii. pp. 239—241. [5] James had sufficient sagacity to penetrate the character of Laud, and prudence to resist his advancement. 'The plain truth is,' says he, 'that I keep Laud back from all place of rule and authority, because I find he hath a restless spirit, and cannot see when matters are well, but loves to toss and change, and to bring things to a pitch of reformation floating in his own brain, which may endanger the steadfastness of that which is in a good pass, God be praised. I speak not at random, he hath made himself known to me to be such a one: for when three years ago I had obtained of the assembly of Perth to consent to five articles of order and decency in correspondence with this church of England, I gave them promise by attestation of faith made, that I would try their obedience no further anent ecclesiastical affairs, nor put them out of their own way, which

effect the restoration of popery; the attempt to employ the ships of England in reducing Rochelle, then occupied by the Protestants of France; and the discovery of the misrepresentations[6], by which the duke of Buckingham had in the late reign obtained the concurrence of the parliament in the war with Spain; all combined in preparing the minds of his subjects for opposing his demands in the very commencement of his government, and drew a petition from both houses against recusants in answer to the speech from the throne.

Thus was Charles involved at once in a foreign war, requiring liberal contributions from his subjects, and in a domestic struggle with his parliament, from which alone these contributions could be regularly obtained. As he appears to have been inflexibly steady in the pursuit of his objects, he would not relinquish either the war, or his maxims of government; and, when he perceived that the parliament, having granted a small supply, was proceeding to inquire into grievances, instead of furnishing such further aid, as he required, he put an end to its deliberations by an abrupt dissolution. He then resorted to a forced loan, and to a compulsory acceptance of the honour of knighthood, as expedients for enabling him to prosecute the war without listening to the remonstrances of his subjects. The insufficiency of these resources however compelled him, at the

custom has made pleasing unto them, with any new encroachments . . . yet this man hath pressed me to invite them to a nearer conjunction with the liturgy and canons of this nation; but I sent him back again with the frivolous draught he had drawn . . . For all this he feared not mine anger, but assaulted me again with another ill-fangled platform, to make that stubborn kirk stoop more to the English pattern: but I durst not play fast and loose with my word.'—Bishop Hacket's Life of Archbishop Williams, part i. p. 64. London, 1693. That Laud notwithstanding was not inclined to popery, is sufficiently manifest from the efforts, which he successfully exerted to recover Chillingworth, who had been induced to embrace the religion of Rome. —Life of Chillingworth, prefixed to his works. London, 1742. In his defence at his trial he recited a list of twenty-one persons, whom he had converted from popery to the church of England.—Carwithen's Hist. of the Church of England, vol. ii. p. 421. London, 1829.

[6] Rapin, vol. ii. p. 241. The duke, when he determined to break off the treaty for the Spanish alliance, had represented not only that the court of Spain was insincere in the negotiation, but also that the prince was in danger of being detained all his life in that country.—Ibid. p. 225.

close of the first year of his reign, to assemble another parliament.

Though some precaution had been employed for excluding the most active opponents of the court, this assembly soon manifested its determination to attack the duke of Buckingham, as the grand author of the public grievances, and to render its power over the supplies instrumental to the public redress. The king immediately committed himself with his people on the great question of the constitution, declaring that he would not permit the conduct of any of his ministers to be subjected to parliamentary enquiry, and stating, as a sufficient justification of the duke, that he had acted by his own orders. In the course of the discussion he distinctly denied the right of the parliament to exercise any such control over the administration of the government, even intimating that on its obsequiousness would depend the continuance of a parliamentary constitution. The parliament persisted in its efforts to procure the removal of the obnoxious minister; the king was not less resolute in protecting his favourite against the complaints of the parliament; and another dissolution widened the breach between them, while a remonstrance framed by the commons, and a declaration issued by the king, began the appeal to the people.

New and more violent expedients than on the former dissolution, were then employed for exacting money. In disregard of a promise made to the parliament, a commission was issued for compounding with popish recusants. To enforce a loan soldiers were quartered on the refractory, the more obstinate of the higher classes were imprisoned[7], and those of the lower were enrolled in the army. The clergy were at the same time directed to inculcate, as a religious doctrine, the duty of yielding implicit obedience to the royal commands, a measure which increased the hostility of the Puritans to the established church.

The necessities created by his foreign engagements, aggravated by a war with France, in which the passions of the duke of Buckingham are supposed to have involved him[8],

[7] To the discussion, which arose out of the case of the persons so imprisoned, we owe the continued assertion of the exemption from arbitrary imprisonment, as the right of English subjects, and its ultimate establishment by the statute of Charles II.—Hallam's Const. Hist. of England, vol. i. p. 524.

[8] In his negotiation for the

soon compelled the king to resort to a third parliament for that more considerable aid, by which he might be enabled to secure an advantageous result. To conciliate it, the persons imprisoned for refusing to contribute to the loan, were previously enlarged, but with so little operation on the public mind, that almost all were elected to serve in the new parliament. The former contests were accordingly renewed with augmented violence. To assert the liberties, which they claimed as their inheritance, the commons prepared a bill, which they named a petition of right[9], as comprehending only liberties derived from their ancestors, and not depending on the favour or concession of the crown. This decisive proceeding the king first endeavoured to avert by the interposition of the lords, and then to evade by a general and ambiguous answer; but the commons were inflexible in their demand, and he was at length obliged to express consent in the accustomed form. A new disagreement arose, when they began to enquire into the several grievances, which had given occasion to this formal vindication of the public rights. The parliament was on this account pro-

marriage of the king he had been tempted to offer his own addresses to the queen of France, who, it appears, had also received those of the minister, cardinal Richelieu. When therefore the duke was making preparations for another visit to Paris, the jealous cardinal procured a message from the king, informing him that he must not think of the journey. The duke, in a passion resembling the extravagancies of romantic fiction, rather than the transactions of history, swore that he would see the queen in spite of all the power of France, and from that moment determined to engage the two countries in hostilities.—Hume, vol. vi. p. 259. By the mismanagement of this war, the command of which had been intrusted to him, the duke fell into great disgrace, and Burnet has, on the authority of the earl of Lauderdale and the duke de Rohan, referred this mismanagement to the same intrigue. According to this account the cardinal Richelieu prevailed with the king of France, to cause his queen to write a fond letter to the duke of Buckingham, assuring him that, if he would suffer Rochelle to fall, he should have leave to come to France. Disappointed by the non-performance of the condition, he then resolved to prosecute the war with more vigour, but just at that time fell by the stroke of an assassin.—Burnet, vol. i. p. 28.

[9] The grievances or abuses, to which it refers, are 1. the exaction of money under the name of loans; 2. the imprisonment of those who refused compliance; 3. the billeting of soldiers; and 4. commissions issued for trying military offenders by martial law.

rogued immediately after a supply had been granted, and was in the following year dissolved after a short session, when the king had already violated the petition of right by levying duties not authorised by statute[10], and the privileges of parliament by imprisoning some of the most active members of the house of commons.

The dissolution of this third parliament, which occurred about the end of the fourth year of the reign of Charles, was succeeded by an interval of eleven years, in which this monarch felt himself discharged from the obligation of convening these obnoxious assemblies; nor did he afterwards resort to so disagreeable an expedient, but because he had involved himself in a contest with his subjects of Scotland, which he could not maintain without the assistance of the English legislature. The scheme of arbitrary power, which he had originally proposed to realise with the aid of a parliament, he in this interval determined to execute without its co-operation. When the poignard of an assassin had deprived him of his favourite, the duke of Buckingham, he found in Sir Thomas Wentworth, afterwards the earl of Strafford, a more powerful agent of his ambition, and at the same time a more odious object of the public indignation. Laud also, who had been from the beginning of his reign a confidential adviser in the affairs of religion, preserved an uncontrolled influence over his mind. These two counsellors, of whom the former, haughty and violent by his natural character, was ready and forward in every plan of despotism, and the latter, though not disposed to become a Roman Catholic, was however eager to introduce ceremonials offen-

[10] 'The duties of tonnage and poundage were at first usually granted only for a stated term of years, as for two years in 5 Rich. II.; but in Henry the sixth's time they were granted him for life by a statute in the thirty-first year of his reign; and again to Edward IV. for the term of his life also; since which time they were regularly granted to all his successors for life, sometimes at the first, sometimes at other subsequent parliaments, 'till the reign of Charles I., when, as the noble historian expresses it, his ministers were not sufficiently solicitous for a renewal of this legal grant.'—Blackstone's Comm., book i. ch. viii. It appears that Edward IV. and all his successors had been permitted to levy these duties from the commencements of their reigns, though they had not been granted by the parliament.—Parl. Hist., vol. viii. pp. 339, 340. This however had been forbidden by the law founded on the petition of right.

sive to the Puritans[11], and favoured a doctrine[12], which they unjustly considered as connected with popery, aided and encouraged him in every measure, which could widen the breach between him and his subjects, and hasten the crisis of the government.

Among the political grievances, which in this period of avowed despotism exasperated the public mind, one of the most remarkable, especially as it plainly indicated the disposition of the king to establish an arbitrary government, was the appointment of Sir Thomas Wentworth to the presidency of the north, accompanied by numerous instructions violating, or exceeding, the established laws. But the measure, which most directly affected the public interest and feeling, was the famous exaction of ship-money. This exaction was unsuccessfully resisted by Hampden, in an appeal to the laws of his country. The alarm however attending the perverted administration of the judicial power, thus transformed into an engine of despotism, instead of being the shield of the liberty and property of the people, served, more than any other provocation, to unite with the Puritans those who were sincerely zealous for the preservation of the public interests, and thus to combine a formidable opposition to the royal pretensions. The single precedent, which could be pleaded, was the contribution of armed

[11] A rich and large crucifix, embroidered with gold and silver, in a fair piece of arras, was hung up in his majesty's chapel over the altar, to which the chaplains were ordered to make their best bows, Laud himself setting the example. Pictures also were set up in churches, consecrations were used after the Romish manner, and copes were worn at the sacrament.—Harris's Life of Charles II. pp. 190, 191.

[12] The doctrine of Arminius, which among Protestants was opposed to that of Calvin. As the reformation had been maintained on the denial of the merit of all human performances, the doctrine of Arminius, that the Deity will reward men according to their works, though not for any merit belonging to them, was considered by many as approximating to the church of Rome. 'The archbishop,' says Clarendon, 'had all his life eminently opposed Calvin's doctrine in these controversies, before the name of Arminius was taken notice of, or his opinions heard of; and therefore, for want of another name, they had called him a papist, which nobody believed him to be, and he had more manifested the contrary in his disputations and writings than most men had done; and it may be the other found the more severe and rigorous usage from him, for their propagating that calumny against him.'—Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 93.

shipping, furnished by the maritime towns to Elizabeth, when the *armada* of Spain had excited great and general apprehension. The demand of Charles was justified only by vague and insufficient pretexts; it was, in disregard of the enactment founded on the petition of right, a rateable assessment of money; and it was in the second year extended over every part of the kingdom, instead of being, like the aid afforded to Elizabeth, limited to maritime and trading towns.

The war with France, which had been wantonly undertaken, was terminated without difficulty. That with Spain had been in reality abandoned from the time, when the war with France was commenced, the Spaniards also, contented with not being attacked, having refrained from any enterprises against the English dominions. Being thus at peace with foreign nations, being freed from the domestic embarrassment of a parliament, and having during three or four years accustomed his English subjects to regard his will as the law, Charles deemed this a favourable opportunity for completing the scheme of reducing the church of Scotland to an entire conformity with the ecclesiastical establishment of England, which had been begun by his father. He accordingly proceeded to rouse the Scots into action, by an attempt at once the most offensive to their sentiments and habits, and the most alarming to the puritanic party of his English subjects, and thus prepared the train, the explosion of which was afterwards to overwhelm in one common destruction his own person and the constitutions of his three kingdoms.

The king had already alienated the nobles of Scotland, by his imperfectly successful efforts to accomplish a resumption of the impropriated tithes and benefices[13], the operation of

[13] 'At the reformation no provision had been made for the clergy till a third of the benefices retained by the popish incumbents was appropriated for their support. When the monastic benefices were impropriated, or erected into temporal lordships, the thirds were frequently discharged or commuted, and the provision, which was always scanty, became altogether inadequate on the revival of prelacy, when the thirds of benefices were assigned to the bishops, and the maintenance of the clergy within each diocese was intrusted to their care. On the expedition of James to Scotland, a committee of parliament was first appointed, to allot a stipendiary provision to each minister from the tithes of his parish, moderate, yet not inadequate to the times; but from the

which was afterwards visible in the union of the nobles with the presbyterian adversaries of the crown. The war of Germany had also provided a military school of officers for that people, which was soon to act upon the government of England, some of their troops [14], which in the beginning of that war had served in the Danish army, having enlisted themselves in the service of Sweden under the celebrated Gustavus Adolphus, and others having been sent to his assistance by Charles, in the hope of effecting the restitution of the Palatinate.

In a nation thus prepared for insurrection, the [15] king procured the enactment of a law, empowering him to regulate the habits of the clergy, which was considered as authorising the introduction of the surplice and the cope. The national sentiment of religion was immediately afterwards yet more alarmed by the Arminian doctrine, which the younger prelates were induced by Laud to inculcate in their sermons [16]. The irritation of the malecontents was completed by the trial and condemnation of lord Balmerino [17], for concealing a seditious libel, which was the germ of the cele-

interested policy of the commissioners the poverty of the clergy was neither relieved, nor their dependence alleviated.'—Laing, vol. i. pp. 91, 92. The resumption of the impropriate tithes from the nobles was favoured by the landholders, who had been oppressed by their rapacity; but, though the latter had thus acquired a right to sue for a valuation, or *modus*, and, unless when appropriated to ecclesiastics, to purchase at a valuation of nine years the tithes of their own estates, they were seldom able to cope with the nobles, on account of the tediousness of litigation and the scarcity of money. If this arrangement had been effected, a revenue of six per cent. out of all tithes was to have been reserved to the crown, which also acquired a right of redeeming at a valuation of ten years the rents of the lands of the church, but was through poverty unable to make these purchases.—Ibid., vol. i. pp. 93—96. By the constitution of the church of Scotland, as confirmed at the union, the stipends of ministers are settled by the parliament, to be paid by the *heritors*, or persons receiving the tithes.—Mem. of the Church of Scotland, p. 328. Lond., 1717. "Accordingly, in this parliament, his (Charles's) tithe policy was finally adjusted upon its present basis, and at the same time he added another inestimable benefit to the Scotish people, in the statute for the endowment of parochial schools."—Montrose and the Covenanters, by Mr. Napier, vol. i. p. 99. Lond. 1838.

[14] Laing, vol. i. p. 97.

[15] It has been represented that this law had really been rejected, though declared to have passed; but this has been disproved by Mr. Napier.—Ibid., vol. i. pp. 521, &c.

[16] Laing, vol. i. p. 105.

[17] Napier, vol. i. pp. 103, &c.

brated *covenant*. Their hopes on the other hand were encouraged by his pardon.

When the Scots had been thus alarmed by the officious promulgation of a religious doctrine repugnant to their principles, and taught to believe that the perverted administration of justice had left them without any other security, than that which they could procure for themselves, Charles proceeded to prosecute an enterprise, from which James had been compelled to desist, the introduction of a liturgy and canons corresponding to those of the English church [18]. The new liturgy, offensive as the innovation was in itself, was rendered yet more irritating by some injudicious changes. The prelates of Scotland [19] having required that a distinct liturgy should be prepared for their country, as more suitable to the dignity of an independent nation than a mere transcript of that of England, some slight alterations were introduced; but, perhaps in a persuasion that the church of Rome, though corrupted, was yet the mother-church, to which Protestants by mutual concession might ultimately be reconciled, it unfortunately happened, that these alterations were so many approaches to the Roman missal [20].

The sudden violence of an old woman began the contest [21]; a tumult of the populace was followed by a regular associ-

[18] In an early period of the reformation the order of Geneva appears to have been adopted in Scotland for public worship; its prayers however were proposed only as an example for imitation, not enjoined as a form to be strictly observed. An assembly of the prelates had ordained, that the Genevan form should be revised, and a uniform liturgy and canons prepared for the church; but, on account of the opposition given to the articles of Perth, the execution of this order was suspended during the reign of James. It was resumed when Charles visited Scotland. The canons were then compiled before the liturgy could be prepared, and absurdly enjoined the use of a liturgy not yet composed.—Laing, vol. i. pp. 113, 114. [19] Ibid., pp. 114, 115. [20] In celebrating the eucharist the priest passed from the northern side of the table to the front with his back to the congregation; the consecration of the elements was performed by a prayer expressive of the real presence; and the elevation of the elements bore the character of an actual oblation then made by the priest. — Ibid., pp. 115, 116. Mr. Hallam attributes the alterations wholly to the desire of Laud, to prepare the way for similar changes in England.—Constit. Hist., vol. iii. p. 427. [21] Villain, said she, dost thou say mass at my lug? And she immediately threw at the head of the dean the stool, on which she had sat.—Laing, vol. i. p. 119.

ation of persons of every rank; and the institution of *the tables*[22], to which the council had inadvertently assented, gave strength and stability to their union. Though Charles, by attempting to introduce his liturgy without the consent either of the parliament or of the assembly of the church, had endeavoured to subvert at once the political and the ecclesiastical constitution of the state, he had provided no force to support the execution of his project; and unable to enforce it by arms, though resolved not to relinquish it, he eventually transferred to *the tables* the entire authority of the council. To disconcert the intrigues of the court, and to render their own union more intimate and permanent, the confederates proposed the memorable renewal of the national covenant, which had been first formed in the commencement of the reformation, and had been twice repeated in its progress. Within two months almost all Scotland entered into this solemn engagement, with an additional declaration of hostility to the liturgy, the canons, and episcopacy[23], the original covenant having been opposed only to the church of Rome.

The renewal of the covenant was followed by a series of negotiations, which ended in open hostilities. The king, destitute of a force to oppose the league[24], neglected to dissolve it by timely concession; the assembly, when at length permitted to meet, proceeded from opposing the liturgy to attack the prelates; and the preservation of the episcopal order in Scotland appeared to Charles a sufficient

[22] As the late tumults were ascribed to the confluence of persons, who had resorted to Edinburgh to supplicate the council against the liturgy, the supplicants, who had returned thither in much increased numbers, availed themselves of the fair pretext thus afforded for appointing a few to act as representatives of the whole body. A proportion of the nobility was first appointed, and from each county two of the gentry, from each presbytery and borough one or more of the clergy and burgesses, were selected as commissioners for their respective orders. This body, which was distinguished by the name of *the tables*, was divided into subordinate tables, to attend when required: over whose separate deliberations a general table of four from each of the others was appointed to preside.—Laing, vol. i. pp. 125, 126. [23] Clarendon, vol. i. p. 111. Laing, vol. i. p. 135. [24] 'A troop of horse and a regiment of foot had prevented all that followed, or rather had by all appearance established an arbitrary government in that kingdom.'—Burnet, vol. i. p. 17.

reason for collecting a body of English forces, and marching them against his Scotish subjects. It was the good fortune of these countries to fight their own quarrel with little interposition from foreign nations. The neighbouring states of the continent, being nearly balanced in the struggle of Austria and France, felt little interest in the domestic contention of these islands, and furnished but inconsiderable assistance to any of the parties[25]. The contest was therefore a domestic struggle of the yet ill-adjusted members of a complex government, and consequently most fitted to produce a favourable result.

After an[26] ineffectual attempt to carry on the Scotish war without resorting to an English parliament for aid, the king found himself reduced to the embarrassing alternative of either conceding all the pretensions of his irritated subjects in the one kingdom, or restoring in the other that parliamentary constitution, which after repeated ruptures had been during eleven years wholly disused. It is certain however[27], notwithstanding the contrary assertion of Hume, that the king might even then have formed an administration in England of the popular leaders, all of whom had agreed to establish the revenue, and one of whom, the earl of Bedford, had undertaken the preservation of the earl of Strafford[28]. But Charles would neither satisfy the Scots, nor intrust the administration of England to the popular leaders. On the contrary, as if desirous of uniting the disaffected of both countries in one common bond of apprehension, he alarmed the opposition in each parliament by an unsuccessful effort to subject the leaders to his venge-

[25] France, from policy, had fomented the first disorders in Scotland, had sent over arms to the Irish rebels, and continued to give countenance to the English parliament; Spain, from bigotry, furnished the Irish with some supplies of money and arms. The prince of Orange, closely allied to the crown, encouraged English officers, who served in the Low Countries, to enlist in the king's army; the Scotch officers, who had been formed in Germany, chiefly took part with the parliament.—Hume, vol. vi. p. 548. [26] From Napier's Hist. of Montrose and the Covenanters it has recently appeared, that the efforts of the king, were rendered ineffectual by the treachery of the marquis of Hamilton, who was entrusted with the command, vol. i. p. 281. [27] Laing, vol. i. p. 204. [28] The negotiation failed, because the king required the preservation of Strafford, as a service to be performed previously to their appointment.—Clarendon, vol. i. pp. 210, 211, 254.

ance. In Scotland he endeavoured to arrest the marquesses of Argyle and Hamilton, an attempt apparently so desultory[29], that it has been characteristically denominated *the incident*; in England he impeached lord Kimbolton and five members of the house of commons, and rashly and unconstitutionally endeavoured to execute in person the arrest of the latter, a measure regarded by all the historians as the immediate occasion of the subsequent disorders[30].

Thus the domestic war with Scotland completed what the foreign wars with Spain and France had begun, and the reign of Charles appears to have been one connected series of action, all the parts of which had a common tendency to excite against him the resistance of his subjects. His earlier wars, though but faintly prosecuted, had involved him in difficulties, which served him as pretexts for exertions of arbitrary power in exacting supplies; and his struggles with the Scots, while it reduced him to a dependence on the English parliament, brought a whole people into co-operation with the discontented of his English subjects, of whom some were prepared for the junction by a similarity of religious opinion, and all respected the Scots as a nation contending in the same cause of civil and religious liberty.

The natural consequences of the measures adopted by the king in Scotland, were the renovation of the presbyterian system and the commencement of military operations[31]. An assembly of the church, to which Charles had most reluctantly consented, was convened in the year 1638; to control the clergy, who might either be obsequious to the prelates, or domineering in regard to the laity, lay-elders were again introduced; and the assembly, strengthened by the support of the nobility and chief gentry, proceeded, in utter disregard of a dissolution, to abolish the episcopal order with all the accompanying institutions and regulations. Charles immediately prepared to reduce the refractory assembly by arms, and the Scots made every preparation in their power to resist the forces of the king. The earlier plan of the Scots was limited to a defensive war, and it is said that they were tempted to advance into Eng-

[29] Laing, vol. i. p. 206. [30] Clarendon, vol. ii. pp. 377, 383. Whitelock's Memorials, p. 51. Lond., 1682. Hume, vol. vi. p. 512.
[31] Laing, vol. i. pp. 141—149. Burnet, vol. i. p. 20.

land in the year 1640 by an artifice of lord Saville[32], who produced an engagement with forged subscriptions of the most considerable men in England, promising a junction.

The parliament, which Charles convened in England at the rupture with the Scots, was precipitately dissolved; but the necessity of his affairs soon compelled him to assemble another, which has been distinguished in history by the name of the long parliament. Meeting in such circumstances, the new parliament could not fail to adopt some decisive measures of opposition. The angry dissolution of four parliaments, the violation of their necessary privileges, the long discontinuance of such assemblies, the arbitrary exaction of supplies, the perversion of the judicial power, and the violence offered to the religious sentiments of the nation, both in the severity exercised upon Presbyterians, and the indulgence granted to Roman Catholics, all presented themselves as grievances demanding speedy and effectual redress. The presence of a Scotish army within the kingdom, claiming the redress of similar grievances, and professing a disposition to co-operate for the attainment of the same objects, assured the parliament of a support, which the king had already found himself unable to withstand.

The first measures of the long parliament were directed against those, who were considered as the instigators and chief agents of the public grievances. The earl of Strafford and archbishop Laud were accordingly impeached of high treason, Scotish commissioners having stipulated with others of England for both prosecutions[33], and uniting with the English commons in the accusation of the prelate.

In the case of the duke of Buckingham, who had been the favourite and minister of Charles from the commencement of his reign until his own death, or during about three years and a half, the removal from the person and councils of the king appears to have been all which was in contemplation with the party opposed to the court. Against the earl of Strafford, who had succeeded him, a far more violent spirit actuated the commons, and it was resolved to bring him to the block. His superior capacity[34], alarming

[32] Burnet, vol. i. p. 16. [33] Laing, vol. i. p. 186. [34] Ibid. p. 500.

the popular leaders, induced them to anticipate against him the severity, which they feared; that he was a deserter from the popular cause, enhanced the guilt of the long series of arbitrary measures, which he had dictated; and it happened that he had incurred the hatred also of the two other kingdoms connected with England[35], the Scots regarding him and Laud as the advisers of the hostilities against them, and the Irish charging him with various acts of oppression in his government of their country.

The commons of England, unable to procure the condemnation of the earl of Strafford by a regular proceeding, resorted to the expedient of a bill of attainder, to which the king reluctantly assented[36]. Of this assent the king bitterly repented, declaring at his own execution, that he considered the death, which he was then to suffer, as the just judgment of God for his acquiescence. The death of the minister appears indeed to have been a step in the progress towards the consummation of the disorder of the government, which was accomplished in the death of the king. Elizabeth, by the execution of the Scotish queen, had set the example of the trial and punishment of a sovereign, though not by her own subjects, nor for her conduct in her own government. In the trial and condemnation of the earl of Strafford[37] a new species of treason, applicable to a so-

[35] Hume, vol. vi. pp. 404, 405.

[36] The queen appears to have been very directly accessary to his condemnation. 'It was carried to the queen, as if Hollis (in a negotiation with the opposite party) had engaged that the earl of Strafford should accuse her, and discover all he knew: so the queen not only diverted the king from going to the parliament, changing the speech into a message all writ with the king's own hand, and sent to the house of lords by the prince of Wales, which Hollis had said would have perhaps done as well, the king being apt to spoil things by an unacceptable manner; but to the wonder of the whole world the queen prevailed with him to add that mean postscript, *If he must die, it were charity to reprieve him till Saturday*, which was a very unhandsome giving up of the whole message. When it was communicated to both houses, the whole court-party was plainly against it: and so he fell truly by the queen's means.'—Burnet, vol. i. p. 20.

[37] The crime of endeavouring to subvert the fundamental laws being then for the first time declared to be treasonable. It has been represented that a clause was introduced into this bill of attainder, enacting that it should never be drawn into precedent; but that clause related only to the ordinary administration of justice, being expressed in the following words, 'provided that no judge or judges, justice or justices

vereign equally as to a minister, was invented for the occasion. From this the progress was not long to the execution of the sovereign. The charge of levying war against the parliament was not very different from that, on which his minister had suffered death; and a high court of justice, erected by the triumphant commons, was but an improvement of the bill of attainder, which their importunity had before extorted from the other members of the legislature.

A more immediate result of this impeachment, which was directly subversive of the constitution, was that it gave occasion to the law, by which it was ordained that the parliament should not be dissolved without the consent of the two houses. The ostensible pretext was[38] that those, who had lent money to the government for satisfying the Scotish army, would not be satisfied in regard to their security, if the existence of the parliament were uncertain. The real motive was an apprehension of an intention of the king to dismiss the parliament, and then to exercise his vengeance on those who had opposed the government. The consent given by the king has been with probability ascribed to the shame and alarm, caused by the discovery of a plot for bringing the army from the north to overawe the parliament, and save the impeached minister.

With the exception of the attainder of Strafford, it has been admitted, even by Hume[39], that the earlier measures of this parliament were eminently beneficial. The abolition of the two great engines of tyranny, civil and ecclesiastical, the courts of star-chamber[40] and of high-commis-

whatsoever, shall adjudge, or interpret, any act or thing to be treason, nor hear, or determine, any treason, in any other manner, than he, or they, should, or ought, to have done, before the making of this act.'—Welwood's Memoirs, p. 47. "This bill was opposed by Selden and the more moderate lawyers on the liberal side; and could hardly have been pushed through but for the newly-discovered evidence brought forward by Sir Harry Vane respecting Strafford's declaration in council, that the king, having tried the affection of his people, was absolved from all rule of government; and that the army from Ireland might reduce this kingdom to obedience."—Lord Campbell's Lives of the Lord Chancellors, vol. ii. p. 611.

[38] Hallam's Constit. History, vol. ii. pp. 153—156. Burnet has ascribed to the influence of the queen the consent given by the king to the act for protecting the parliament from the dissolution: vol. i. p. 19.

[39] Vol. vi. p. 466.

[40] The court of star-chamber, which was of very ancient original,

sion[41]; the suppression of all other irregular jurisdictions, particularly of the two councils of the north and of Wales[42]; the establishment of the independence of the judges, a measure adopted and re-enacted after the revolution; a law ordaining that a new parliament should be assembled at least once in three years[43]; and the formal prohibition of the assessment of ship-money; these are measures so constitutional, and so directly advantageous, that no diversity of opinion can well be supposed to exist on the subject. And when it is considered, that some of these important regulations[44], with

received its modern form from a statute of the third year of Henry VII. Its power was much increased by Wolsey in the reign of Henry VIII., and yet more by succeeding sovereigns.—Blackstone, book iv. ch. xix. Parl. Hist., vol. ix. pp. 229, 230. The name is derived by Blackstone from a Hebrew word, *shetàr*, signifying a *covenant*, the contracts of the Jews being ordered to be deposited in certain places, the most considerable of which was probably the room occupied by this court. [41] The court of high-commission was erected by a statute of the first year of the reign of Elizabeth, in the place of a larger jurisdiction, which had been exercised under the authority of the pope. It was intended for the due regulation of the church; but the words, by which it was constituted, were so general, that the power of the commissioners became almost despotic.—Blackstone, book iii. ch. iii. [42] The council of the north, constituted in the thirty-first year of Henry VIII., was occasioned by six insurrections in the northern counties, which had followed the suppression of religious houses. In the reign of James I. the commission of the president directed, that it should observe instructions then issued, instead of proceeding as before, according to the law of the land. A new instruction was issued to the earl of Strafford, requiring that the court should observe all the ordinances and determinations, which were, or should be made, by the council, or court of high-commission.—Parl. Hist., vol. ix. pp. 267—269. The council of Wales was instituted by the statute of the thirty-fourth of Henry VIII. It pretended to a jurisdiction over the four bordering shires of Gloucester, Worcester, Hereford, and Salop. —Hallam's Constit. Hist. vol. i. p. 448. [43] When the bill for prohibiting the dissolution of the long parliament, was sent to the lords, it was there proposed, in reference to this law, to limit its operation to two years, but the commons adhered to their original proposition.—Ibid., vol. ii. p. 155. The act itself was repealed after the restoration.

[44] The abrogation of the high-commission, the prohibition of arbitrary proclamations, the regulation of the privy council, and the institution of triennial parliaments, were enacted by the Scotish, as by the English parliament. The measures of reformation peculiarly belonging to Scotland were the suppression of the lords of articles, and the introduction of representatives of the lesser barons, as a third estate, to supply the place of the absent prelates.—Laing, vol. i. pp. 166, 202, 203.

others peculiarly demanded by local circumstances, were about the same time adopted by the parliament of Scotland, it must appear with how little reason the historian has ventured to assert[45], that the disorders in Scotland entirely, and those in England mostly, proceeded from a puritanic abhorrence of a religious ritual. In regard to England indeed it has been recorded by lord Clarendon[46], that St. John rejoiced at the dissolution of the parliament, which had immediately preceded the long parliament, because it could never have been brought to do what he conceived to be necessary; and that even the long parliament, when the extirpation of episcopacy was first pressed upon the house of commons by a petition, could only be induced, after a long debate, to determine that the petition should not be rejected.

But, though puritanism was not the great and almost exclusive cause of the movements of this period, it must be considered as an exciting principle, by which the public zeal for freedom was stimulated to action; and when, in a combination of favourable circumstances, it had urged the mass of the people so far, as a concern for constitutional freedom would have authorised them to proceed, it is natural that it should have acquired so much influence, as to impel them a yet greater length, even to the subversion of that constitution, which was originally the object of the struggle. The effort, which overcame the resistance of the royal power, was in this manner continued to its suppression. A political experience of the mischiefs of extreme measures was yet wanted, to enable the people of England to fix with a judicious moderation the landmarks of their rights amidst the alternations of contending factions.

It accordingly soon appeared, that the parliament was not to be satisfied with the provisions, by which the public grievances had been redressed. The lower house began to question the title of the bishops to sit in parliament, a question indeed favourably entertained by all, who wished to lessen the royal influence in the house of lords:[47] an act

[45] Hume, vol. vi. p. 429. [46] Clarendon, vol. i. pp. 140, 203.

[47] As the temporal peers were then less numerous than at present, the bishops greatly influenced the resolutions of the upper house, and frequently caused them to be directly opposed to those of the lower.—Rapin, vol. ii. p. 359.

was procured, as has been mentioned, prohibiting the dissolution of the parliament without its own concurrence, which in effect dethroned the king by rendering the parliament independent: and the commons began to prepare a formal remonstrance on the state of the kingdom, which recapitulated the grievances already remedied, and was therefore manifestly designed to effect a final rupture with the crown.

The bishops, whose right of sitting in parliament was questioned in the year 1640, were two years afterwards excluded, and thus the political capacity of one of the orders of the state was annihilated. This measure was facilitated, and probably expedited, by the indiscretion of some of the bishops themselves. In the year 1641, when they were subjected to alarming insults from the tumultuous crowd assembled about Westminster and Whitehall, twelve of them most unwisely protested against all resolutions, which should pass during their enforced absence, and thereby drew upon themselves from the commons an impeachment for high treason, in having endeavoured to invalidate the authority of the legislature. The impeachment seems to have been forgotten in the public confusion; but the vengeance of the commons was in the following year inflicted upon the whole order by their exclusion from the parliament, to which the king consented, persuaded by the queen[48], who hoped thereby to facilitate her own escape from the kingdom.

In this crisis of the government of England the unhappy politics of Ireland entered into the combination. Though the Roman Catholics of Ireland attached themselves to the support of the crown, the impulse, which they gave at this time, decided the struggle in favour of the parliament. An insurrection of that party, for which their leader pleaded a pretended commission from the king[49], occurring in the year

[48] Clarendon, vol. i. p. 428. This princess appears indeed to have been the evil genius of Charles. Burnet has described her as a woman of no judgment, but by the liveliness of her discourse making always a great impression on the king.—Vol. i. p. 19. [49] Sir Phelim O'Neal, at his execution in the year 1652, distinctly and solemnly denied, that he had ever received any such commission from the king, though tempted by an offer of being restored to his estate and liberty, if he could produce any material and authentic proof. He at the same time explained how he had deceived his followers, saying that he had affixed to a forged commission a great seal, which had been torn from a patent found in plundering the castle of Charlemont.—Leland, vol. iii. pp. 120, 394, 395.

1641, at the moment when the commons of England were seeking pretexts for a rupture with the crown, was an event the most favourable to the views of the latter, which the imagination could have devised. All the representations which they had made concerning the indulgence shown to Roman Catholics, appeared then to be justified; all their suspicions of the arbitrary designs of the king to be confirmed. Charles was unable to withstand the torrent of the public opinion, and to free himself as much as possible from the imputations cast upon him, committed to the parliament the care of Ireland.

The commons, availing themselves of the hasty concession, assumed, in violation of the constitution, an executive authority. A formal rupture with the crown being however still necessary for affording a free opportunity for their meditated encroachments on the royal prerogative, the remonstrance, which had been partly prepared, was completed and passed, though after a very long debate[50], and by a majority of only eleven voices. By the publication of the remonstrance the appeal was at length formally made to the people. So decisive was this measure esteemed, that Oliver Cromwell declared that, if it had been rejected, he would have quitted England for ever.

Though the government of Ireland had been tranquil from the conclusion of the reign of Elizabeth, or during almost forty years, causes had been operating through all this interval to produce the catastrophe, which so critically connected the agitations of the two countries. The plantation formed by James in the northern province[51], however beneficial in its general tendency, had excited considerable discontent, not merely as it avowedly deprived the former proprietors of a large portion of their ancient possessions, but also as it subjected them to the fraudulent oppressions of inferior agents, in regard to those portions, which they had been permitted to retain. The discontent thus excited[52]

[50] Parl. Hist., vol. x. pp. 48, 49. [51] Leland, vol. iii. pp. 88, 89.

[52] Ibid. These concessions, which were named *graces*, were very numerous, and would have remedied the various abuses of the Irish government. The most important were that whereby the subjects were secured in the quiet enjoyment of their lands, by limiting the king's title to sixty years; that which admitted recusants to sue in the court of wards, and to practice in the courts of law, by taking an oath of

had been extended by the insincerity, with which the favourable concessions, promised by Charles in the beginning of his reign, were afterwards evaded, especially as it appeared that one motive of this evasion was the design of lord Strafford to subvert the title to every estate in Connaught, that he might accomplish the plan of a western plantation[53], which James had been induced to relinquish. The arbitrary and violent administration of this chief governor[54], though productive of much public advantage in a country little accustomed to a regular enforcement of the laws, added much individual irritation to the general disaffection. All these causes co-operated to exasperate the hereditary antipathy to the English government, and the recent antipathy of religious dissension, into a determination to overthrow at once the civil and ecclesiastical establishments of Ireland.

It appears from the confession of lord Macguire[55], that the year 1628 had been first chosen for insurrection, but that the enterprise had been postponed, because cardinal Richelieu, from whom assistance was expected, was still occupied by a protraction of the war in Italy. Again was the design formed in the year 1634[56], and again abandoned for some reason now unknown. At length the domestic dissensions of the government seemed to promise a favour-

allegiance instead of the oath of supremacy; and that which admitted the inhabitants of Connaught to make a new enrolment of their patents. The king appears to have been insincere in regard to them. They were transmitted to the lord-deputy to be confirmed in a parliament, for holding which a day was named by the king. As this proceeding violated the law of Poynings, which required that a certification of causes and considerations for holding a parliament should have been previously made by the lord-deputy and council of Ireland, the writs of summons were pronounced to be illegal and void. No new writs however were issued, nor was any other time assigned for a legal and regular convention of the Irish parliament, though a voluntary contribution of one hundred and twenty thousand pounds had been accepted as the price of the favours to be conferred. Lord Strafford proceeded to subvert the title to every estate in Connaught.—Ibid., vol. ii. pp. 483—488; vol. iii. pp. 30, 31. The graces were again transmitted in the summer of the year 1641, but the lords justices contrived to elude them by adjourning the parliament, so that they could not then be passed, and the peace of Ireland was in the interval interrupted by rebellion.—Leland, vol. iii. p. 84. [53] This was abandoned on account of the clamour, which it excited in Ireland, and the increasing disorders of England.—Ibid., p. 39. [54] Ibid., pp. 88, 89. [55] Borlase's Hist. of the Irish Rebellion, p. 33. Dublin, 1743. [56] Ibid., p. 2.

able opportunity, independently of foreign succours. It was accordingly determined that, relying on their own resources, the Roman Catholics of Ireland should rise against the government in the year 1641. For the credit of human nature, and of our country, it should be remembered, that the conspiracy was not originally a scheme of massacre[57], but that on the contrary a determination had been formed, that it should be executed with as little bloodshed as possible; nor was that carnage begun[58], which has indelibly dis-

[57] Leland, vol. iii. pp. 103, 118. [58] The number of persons destroyed in this massacre has been very variously reported. By Sir John Temple it has been most extravagantly exaggerated to a hundred and fifty thousand. By Warner, who has examined the matter with much precision, it has been reduced to four thousand and twenty-eight, besides eight thousand killed by bad usage; but some part of each even of these numbers he conceived to be not supported by sufficient evidence.—Warner's History of the Rebellion, vol. ii. pp. 9, 10. Dublin. 1768. Mr. Hallam however considers this estimate as unwarrantably low. Dr. Lingard, he also remarks, has in his own account of the Ulster-rebellion omitted all mention of the massacre.—Constitutional History of England, vol. iii. p. 521, note. Roman Catholics have pretended that this massacre was perpetrated in retaliation of one previously perpetrated by the Protestants, in Island Magee, where three thousand of their party are said to have perished. This statement has been refuted by Leland; and to his arguments it may be added, that lord Castlehaven, against whose authority no objection can be urged, has expressly imputed the massacre to the contrivers of the rebellion, without any allusion to such a palliation.—Earl of Castlehaven's Review, p. 31. London, 1684. Doctor O'Conor has traced the story to the anonymous author of 'A Collection of some Massacres and Murders committed on the Irish, since the 23rd of October, 1641,' which was published in London in the year 1662, when the Act of Settlement was in contemplation. The author, he remarks, says expressly in his preface, that he had no other than *hear-say* for what he asserts; that this *hear-say* evidence had been collected by him, not in Ireland, but in London; and that he published it without any further enquiry in Ireland, because that would require time and trouble, and occasion delay. Doctor O'Conor then proceeds to urge against it an overpowering force of evidence from the silence of contemporary Roman Catholics, and especially of the supreme council of Kilkenny, which in the year 1642 caused an inventory to be prepared of all murders committed by their enemies since the commencement of the rebellion.—Hist. Address, part ii. pp. 232, &c. The Roman Catholic historians, Mac-Geoghegan, Curry, and Plowden, have notwithstanding adopted the story; and even Mr. Butler, though he could not venture to commit his credit upon it, has yet given it as 'the catholic representation,' leaving it to make its own impression, while he quotes with respect the

graced the history of Ireland, until the successful resistance of the English settlers had suggested to the leader of the insurrection, Sir Phelim O'Neal, the inhuman policy of plunging his followers so deep in blood, that retreat and reconciliation might be hopeless.

But, amidst all our horror at the atrocity of the conduct of the insurgents, we must not forget the atrocious policy, with which the local government of the country intercepted the gracious purposes of the sovereign, and impelled the discontented into rebellion. The executive government of Ireland was then held by two lords justices, Sir William Parsons and Sir John Borlase, the latter of whom, being merely a soldier, relinquished to the former the exercise of the civil power. Sir William Parsons, who was thus in effect the sole governor, appears to have been actuated at once by the desire of enriching himself by confiscations, and of gratifying the puritanical party in the English parliament, to which he was indebted for his appointment. He accordingly contrived to elude the intended favour of the king, by intercepting those *graces*, which were again transmitted in the summer of the year 1641[59]. The parliament had then been adjourned until the following November. In the interval the rebellion broke out. The parliament, when it did assemble, was permitted to sit only two days[60], being prorogued to the twenty-fourth of the following February, without having an opportunity of availing itself of the acquiescence of the crown in the representations which had been transmitted to England. The English parliament also had deemed it right to instruct the Irish government[61], to offer a general pardon to those rebels, who should submit within a limited time; but the recommendation was disregarded by the lords justices, who pleaded that two similar proclamations had been already issued without effect. These proclamations however had been so prepared as to be inoperative, the earlier having given no positive assurance of pardon, the later being so restricted as to be evidently insidious. The loyal party[62], conscious of being strong enough to suppress the rebellion, sent a memorial to the king representing the true state of affairs;

Historical and Critical Review of Curry, in which it is maintained.—Hist. Memoirs, vol. ii. p. 371.

[59] Leland, vol. iii. p. 84.

[60] Ibid., pp. 140—143.

[61] Ibid., p. 139.

[62] Ibid., p. 143.

but they were counteracted by agents, whom the lords justices had despatched to the leaders of the parliament. The Roman Catholics of the English pale[63] were in the mean time irritated by a total neglect of their interests and sentiments, and, being ordered to remove from Dublin, were driven into a communication with the insurgents. The earl of Clanricarde in particular, a Roman Catholic, who by extraordinary exertions had maintained the tranquillity of Connaught, was refused every assistance[64], and subjected to every mortification. Though no effort was used to crush a rebellion, which might be productive, enough was done to provoke and exasperate; and parties were sent out, which vied in barbarous violence with the rebels, whom they professed to chastise.

While a puritanical governor was for his own purpose, and that of his party, inflaming the public discontent, the Roman Catholic clergy were on the other hand combining the laity of their church in support of the absolute and unrestrained supremacy of the pope, their struggle being to wrest the dominion of the country from a prince, who would not consent to hold it as a fief of the papacy. Clement VIII.[65] had with this view proposed to defeat the succession of that prince by conferring the three kingdoms upon the lady Arabella Stuart, and causing her to marry the cardinal Farnese, who was to be released from his vows; and was hindered from prosecuting the plan only by failing to gain the assistance of France or Spain. The scheme of ecclesiastical dominion was however earnestly prosecuted. In vain did James relinquish even the qualified supremacy of Elizabeth, by substituting an oath of allegiance for that, by which it was to be acknowledged[66]. In vain was the most entire indulgence given to the attendance on the Romish worship[67]. The contest was not for a liturgy, this would

[63] Leland, vol. iii. p. 147. [64] Ibid., p. 137. [65] Butler's Hist. Mem., vol. i. pp. 269, &c. Lady Arabella Stuart was, like James, descended from Margaret, the eldest daughter of Henry VII. The duke of Parma having a wife, the cardinal his brother was to be secularised for the marriage. [66] Dr. Phelan's Hist. of the Policy of the Church of Rome in Ireland, p. 227. Paul V. by a brief pronounced the oath unlawful. This brief was confirmed in the following year by a second of the same pontiff, and was again enforced by the succeeding pope Urban.—Ibid., pp. 228—230. [67] 'The whole nation enjoyed the undisturbed exercise of their religion, as long as its ministers abstained

have been conceded to Elizabeth, but for the power of the Roman see, which could admit no compromise. A portion of the laity had indeed still continued to be attached to the government, satisfied with the preservation of their properties, and with the forbearance still exercised in regard to their religion. This party the clergy proceeded to include in a political union with themselves. A synod of those of Armagh[68], convened by their primate, declared the war of the Irish to be lawful and pious, and exhorted all persons to unite in their righteous cause. A general synod was then assembled at Kilkenny, by which it was resolved, that a general assembly of the whole nation should be held in the same place. A convention therefore[69], observing much of the forms of a parliament, though disclaiming the name, did accordingly in the year 1642 assemble at Kilkenny, and chose a supreme council of twenty-four persons for the general management of the government. While the assembly renounced the authority of the local government of Ireland, as belonging to a malignant party, it directed that all persons should swear allegiance to the king, whose just prerogatives they professed to maintain. The clergy would have bound the people to consent to no peace, unless the church should have been invested, not only with all its ancient powers, but also with all its ancient possessions. This however was not consistent with the interests of lay-impropriators; and the assembly was contented with directing, that all persons should swear to defend the free exercise of the Roman Catholic religion.

from political intrigue, and from that obtrusive pomp of celebration, which, if not offensive to protestant conscience, was at least an unseemly rivalry with the established church.—Dr. Phelan, p. 252.

[68] Leland, vol. iii. pp. 180—184. [69] This form of government subsisted from October in the year 1642 to the conclusion of the peace in the year 1648 with the marquess of Ormond, sent over from France by the queen and prince for that purpose, at which time however the general assembly constituted twelve persons, to consider and authorise all public acts together with the lord-lieutenant, provision being made for supplying vacancies. These were to continue in the co-administration until the articles of peace should have been settled by act of parliament; and the general assembly was thenceforward convened by the chief governor as a parliament, the executive administration having been resigned.—Diss. prefixed to the Mem. of the Marquis of Clanricarde, pp. xlii. xliii. Dubl., 1744.

The several parties of the triple government were at this time arranged, and their great struggle was already commenced. The Puritans of the English parliament, supported by the Scotish army, had mutilated one member of the legislature by excluding the bishops from the house of lords: the king had erected his standard, and had made his appeal to the general loyalty of the people of England against a puritanical house of commons: and the Roman Catholics of Ireland, professing allegiance to the king, were formed into an organized confederacy, which was secretly controlled and directed by their own hierarchy. The arbitrary schemes of the princes of the house of Stuart found support among the Roman Catholics of Ireland[70], as the republican plans of the English Puritans were aided by the Presbyterians of Scotland. The two accessory kingdoms were thus engaged in maintaining the struggle of the yet ill-combined orders of the English government, and by adhering to opposite interests contributed to effectuate their balanced adjustment.

CHAPTER XVI.

Of the history of Great Britain and Ireland, from the beginning of the civil war in the year 1642, *to the restoration in the year* 1660.

Civil war begun in the year 1642—Solemn league and covenant, 1643—Second invasion of the Scots, 1644—Westminster-directory and confession, and self-denying ordinance, 1645—Third invasion of the Scots, 1648—Charles condemned and executed, and the house of lords abolished, 1649—Navigation act, 1650—Ireland and Scotland reduced, 1651—Oliver Cromwell protector, 1653—A united parliament, 1654—Richard Cromwell protector, 1658—his resignation, 1659—The restoration, 1660—Milton—Dryden.

If to the adjustment of the constitution it had been only necessary that certain principles should be established, by

[70] The estates of the Irish were, according to Sir William Petty, double of those of the English before the rebellion, and their number nearly quintuple, or as eleven to two. He supposed that the number of the Irish was in the year 1641 about 1,200,000, reduced in the year 1652 to 850,000.—Petty's Tracts, pp. 312, 317. Dubl., 1769.

which the functions of its several members should be regulated, and the boundaries of their respective agencies should be ascertained, almost enough had been done in the commencement of the long parliament, nor perhaps would those agitations have been required, to which the government was subsequently exposed. It is indeed most important that certain principles of constitutional right should be well established, as they serve to guide the public efforts for the preservation, or for the improvement, of the government; and Mably has accordingly ascribed much of the inferiority of the government of France to the want of such an authorised standard of public rights, as was enacted in the great charter of England. Vain however are these abstract principles, if they do not practically correspond to the actual condition of the political body, which they should regulate. For the due adjustment of the constitution it was therefore mainly important, that the habits of the government and of the people should be accommodated to the practical observance of the rules of a balanced system. It was accordingly amidst the agitations of the succeeding period, that the political habits of the community were gradually formed; nor did the government settle in the point of adjustment, until it had alternately vibrated to the contrary extremes of democracy and despotism. The earlier of these alternate movements, by which the government was carried on to the extreme of democracy, and thence was brought back to its former position at the restoration of royalty, is the subject of the present chapter.

It should not however be supposed, that even at this time some regulations were not yet deficient, which the improved experience of a later period has taught the nation to adopt. The occurrences of this earlier period of the government had not yet suggested the expediency of providing against a wasteful expenditure of the public money by a permanent arrangement, of restricting the number of the forces to be maintained, and of authorising only for a very limited time the application of martial law to the enforcement of military discipline; nor had the independence of the judges been effectually secured. The expediency of limiting the duration of a parliament had been suggested, and a triennial law had accordingly been enacted by the long parliament

in the commencement of its operations; but this law was disregarded by that very parliament, and formally abrogated after the restoration. This, together with the others, remained therefore for the revolution, which placed William on the throne, and advanced the constitution to a higher state of improvement.

The disposal of the militia was the question[1], which immediately occasioned the civil war. The parliament would not intrust a power so important to a prince, whose sincerity in redressing public grievances they had reason to suspect, and whose personal resentment their leaders had abundant cause to fear. There was then no mutiny-act, which would at once disband a standing army. The power of the sword must therefore have been given without control to the king, or to the parliament, the happy expedient of intrusting it to the king in subordination to the law, not having yet been suggested by the political experience of the nation.

The balance of the British constitution, which has been commonly represented as the result of the direct counteraction of distinct and co-ordinate powers, is really the effect of that reciprocal influence, by which these powers act secretly among themselves, and thus indirectly modify their several operations. Among powers distinct and co-ordinate there must be either concurrence or war; and it was because that the different parts of the English government were then in this situation, that the questions agitated between Charles and his parliament terminated in an appeal to the sword. The public movements, which succeeded, reduced the political system from a state of adverse counteraction to one of reciprocal influences; and the true equilibrium, which in maintaining a distinctness of interests preserves also the combination and unity of the government, was thus at length effected.

All the great movements of the struggle of the English government appear to have been directly influenced by the presbyterian spirit of the Scotish people. The presence of a Scotish army, which had been first raised, and then drawn into England, by the violent measures of Charles, gave support and encouragement to the Presbyterians among the English commons, which these took care to continue by de-

[1] Laing, vol. i. pp. 216—218.

laying its return. The actual assistance of the Scotish forces was after some time employed by the parliament to maintain their contest with their sovereign, the northern army having been induced to march a second time into England in the year 1644. In the year 1648 a third invasion, in support of that king, whom they had twice opposed, and then given up to the English, that they might obtain payment of their arrears[2], decided the death of the monarch[3], and created an occasion, which favoured the advancement of Cromwell. To the same agency[4], may be referred the condemnation and death of archbishop Laud, for this prelate, who had been impeached at the same time with the earl of Strafford, was at length condemned to death for the purpose of encouraging the Scots to enter the second time into England. Amidst these Scotish efforts, it should be remarked, arose the appellation, by which a great party in our government has ever since continued to be distinguished, for an insurrection of the western Scots, whose object was to oppose the royalists concerned in the third invasion, gave occasion to the name of Whigs[5].

This extrinsic agency was exercised upon the English government through the affinity existing between the Scots and the presbyterian leaders[6] of the opposition in England;

[2] Mr. Hallam professes himself inclined to believe, that the Scots would have delivered up the king, though there had been no pecuniary expectation. And he has remarked, that the party in the house of commons, which sought most earnestly to obtain possession of the king's person, and carried all the votes for payment of money to the Scots, was that which had no further aim than an accommodation with him, though doubtless on terms very derogatory to his prerogative.—Hallam's Constit. Hist. vol. ii. pp. 268, 269. [3] Laing, vol. i p. 374. Hist. de Cromwell par Villemain, tome i. p. 180. Paris, 1819.

[4] Ludlow's Memoirs, vol. i. p. 72. Edinb., 1751. The judges could not in this case, as in that of the earl of Strafford, pretend even a constructive treason. The impeachment was accordingly changed into an ordinance for his execution.—Hallam, vol. ii. p. 229.

[5] Laing, vol. i. pp. 365, 366. [6] The English would have been satisfied with a civil league, but the Scots demanded a religious covenant. The first and second article it was found necessary to express in equivocal language, that each party might interpret them in its own sense. The reformation of religion was to be established in England 'according to the word of God and the example of the best reformed churches:' and the existing episcopacy was abolished without abjuring the hierarchy, as the Scots had required.—Ibid, pp. 232, 233.

and if that opposition had been a simple and unmixed party, it must have happened that an ecclesiastical revolution would have been perfected, from which must have resulted a lasting derangement of the political order of the government. The opposition was however by no means simple. Ecclesiastical anarchists, or the Independents, were at first concealed among the Presbyterians, who were themselves a minority in comparison with those, who proposed only the security of their civil liberties. Though however the civil reformers were the more numerous party, the zeal of the Presbyterians was the more active principle. Time and occasion were required for developing the energies of the Independents and their kindred sectaries[7], who were the Jacobins of a religious age.

This successive evolution of party, which appears to be a regular process in every great movement of a people, whether religious or political, was that which most favoured the restoration of the royal government. If the Independents had not come forth from the Presbyterians, and established their own power on the ruin of their former associates, these could not have been induced to unite themselves with the Royalists, and to bring back the monarchy in connexion with an episcopal establishment of the church. The effects of the activity of the Presbyterians would in this case have been permanent, and the original form of the government would not have been restored. But, when this new power was brought to act upon the system, they were gradually driven into co-operation with the friends of episcopacy, the king was again placed upon the throne without any stipulations restraining his authority, and the government was prepared for its other great aberration into the contrary extreme of arbitrary rule.

The vigour, with which the Presbyterians resisted the Independents, long restrained the latter from influencing the public measures, insomuch that the first instance of even

[7] The chief, according to Baxter, were the Anabaptists and Antinomians. He mentions others, which however either soon ceased to exist, or were comprehended among the people afterwards known by the name of Quakers.—Neal, vol. iii. p. 343. The rise of these is referred to the year 1648, when upon the dissolution of all government, both civil and ecclesiastical, George Fox began to promulgate his peculiar tenets. —Ibid., vol. iv. p. 33.

an obscure reservation in their favour, occurs in the terms, in which the Scotish covenant was received in England. Instead of engaging to establish a presbyterian system[8], similar to that of Scotland, Sir Harry Vane contrived to introduce the ambiguous declaration, that a reformation should be effected in England and Ireland 'according to the word of God and the example of the best reformed churches,' a form of expression leaving the field open to every enterprise of change. In little more than a year however from the conclusion of this religious and political alliance[9], the Independents by the dexterity of Cromwell obtained a decisive superiority, though only as the instruments of his ambition. The spirit of persecution, which actuated the English and Scotish Presbyterians, drove this sect to seek support, partly in a negotiation with the king, but chiefly in establishing an influence over the army, in which plan they were favoured by the want of military chaplains. Cromwell, perceiving the assistance, which their influence over the army might afford him for his own advancement, artfully employed them to humble the Presbyterians, until he rendered himself the master of both.

Though the presence of the Scotish army in England had given support and encouragement to the English parliament in commencing the rupture with the king, yet the parliament was not without difficulty brought to that intimate connexion, which was the object of the solemn league and covenant; nor was it until, a year after the commencement of hostilities[10], the successes of the royal forces had created a general apprehension in the minds of the other party, that their leader ventured to negotiate for an aid, which could be obtained only on the terms of an ecclesiastical conformity. On this occasion it was found necessary to consult the sentiments, not only of the Independents, but also of those who were not influenced by any sectarian abhorrence of episcopacy, and a studied ambiguity was introduced into that part of the treaty[11], by which the existing government of the church was to be abolished, the clause, by which it was to have been abjured, being purposely omitted. As by the other ambiguity the presbyterian leaders accommodated the Independents, so by this they satisfied the political reformers.

[8] Laing, vol. i. p. 232. [9] Ibid., p. 283. [10] Laing, vol. i. pp. 228, &c. [11] Ibid., p. 233.

The direct influence of this federal alliance in regard to England passed away with the revolutionary period, in which it had been formed. On Scotland however it has had a lasting operation, for in the year 1645[12] there was framed at Westminster a directory prescribing the topics of extemporary prayer, and a confession of faith in the utmost rigour of Calvinism, which have continued to be regarded as the standards of the church of that country. The English parliament was too much influenced by the political reformers and the Independents, to admit the authoritative discipline at the same time proposed, though it was received into the congenial church of their ally.

As the earlier defeats of the parliamentary forces had given occasion to the formation of the solemn league and covenant, which procured for the Presbyterians the assistance of the Scots, so did the defeat at Newbury[13] facilitate the adoption of the self-denying ordinance[14], which two years afterwards took from the parliament the control of the army, and eventually transferred the ascendency from them to the Independents. The army had been generally converted to independency by the opportunity[15], which the indolence of the presbyterian ministers had afforded their rivals, in disposing them to decline encountering again the hardships of a campaign, when the old regiments had been broken in the service. The functions thus abandoned were discharged by the officers, who depended upon a miraculous influence of the divine Spirit for the instructions, which they preached to the troops. By the self-denying ordinance the army was separated from the parliament, in which the Presbyterians still prevailed. The overthrow of their power was completed by the very artful management[16], with which

[12] Laing, vol. i. pp. 282, 314. [13] Ludlow, vol. i. p. 125. [14] This ordinance, which excluded all members of the legislature from all offices civil and military, was carried in the house of commons, because lord Essex, the general of the parliament, was thought to wish for peace, and had performed such services, that no measure personally offensive to him could be proposed. Whitelock, p. 113. London, 1682. It was resisted four months in the lords, but was adopted when lord Essex had declared, that he would resign his commission.—Harris's Life of Cromwell, pp. 115—118. London, 1772. [15] Neal, vol. iii. p. 252. [16] A dispensation of two or three months was first obtained on account of some alleged necessity of his service. This indulgence was afterwards frequently prolonged by order of the parliament. At

Oliver Cromwell, who had projected the measure, contrived to have himself exempted from its operation.

This extraordinary compound of fanaticism, hypocrisy, cunning, military enterprise, and political ambition, was above all other men fitted to bring into co-operation the disunited factions of the state. Professing to belong to the Presbyterians[17], and secretly negotiating with the Independents; attaching to himself the religious zealots by fanaticism, and evading the suspicions of the political zealots by buffoonery[18]; selecting all his agents with a consummate knowledge of character, and with an unerring felicity seizing all his opportunities; displaying in an advanced period of life a military capacity, which the efforts of a whole life seem necessary to form; and amidst all his enthusiasm[19], and all his treasonable conduct, preserving a correspondence with the party of the king, until he found it impossible to reconcile it with his interest in the army; such was the singular individual[20], who brought his sovereign to trial and execution, reduced to obedience both the Roman Catholics of Ireland and the Presbyterians of Scotland, assumed to himself the power, which he had wrested from the constitutional authorities, effected a parliamentary union of the three parts of the triple monarchy, exalted the national dignity and importance among the potentates of Europe, and left a government so destitute of intrinsic principles, and a people so assimilated after all their violent contentions, that the restoration of the ancient royalty seemed to be almost the spontaneous movement of the nation.

The character of Charles himself assisted much in urging the people to extremities, which favoured the schemes of Cromwell. Influenced by a promise made to the queen[21] that no accommodation should be effected except through her mediation, he adhered with obstinacy to his original

length he remained in command without permission.—Harris, pp. 120—122. [17] Rapin, vol. ii. p. 527. [18] Ludlow, vol. i. p. 207. [19] Ibid., pp. 169, 172, 198, 199. [20] M. Bourienne has annexed to his Memoirs of Napoleon Bonaparte, recently published, a curious treatise composed by the emperor, in which he rejects the notion of a resemblance between his own character, and that either of Cromwell, or of Monk, to each of whom he had been compared, and claims to be considered as fitly compared only to Julius Cæsar. [21] Laing, vol. i. p. 225.

notions of power; and confident that in the contention of parties he should be an indispensable umpire[22], he engaged in complicated and contradictory negotiations with the army, the parliament, and the Scots. A conduct more compliant and more simple might have preserved the life of the king, and restored him to his throne; nor did Cromwell abandon the expectation of combining his own views with the interest of his sovereign, until the obstinacy and duplicity of Charles had allowed time for such a change in the minds of the soldiery, as determined him to look to a higher object.

But, if Charles had connected himself firmly with any of the parties of the state, and had by its assistance been established even unconditionally upon the throne, would anything have been done towards amalgamating those parties, and forming them into a people sufficiently capable of political co-operation? Were the Independents yet satisfied to acquiesce in the existence of any ecclesiastical establishment? Were the republicans yet contented to forego their schemes of popular government? Above all, were the Presbyterians prepared to enter into that combination with the Royalists, which at length effected the re-establishment of the government? The king might have been restored to his throne, but the government could not have made a progress towards its improvement, because the parties of the state would not have acquired the experience necessary for producing a general conviction of the expediency of mutual concession.

The commons and the army began early in the year 1647[23] to constitute two distinct and hostile parties, the king having then been delivered to the former by the Scots, among whom he had sought protection. The Presbyterians, who prevailed among the commons, wished to make advantage of their possession of the person of the king by entering into an agreement with him, and with this design proposed to free themselves from the interference of the Independents, by sending a part of the army into Ireland, and disbanding the remainder. The army, instigated by Cromwell, resisted the scheme of the commons; and the result was that, after a struggle of a few months, it obtained an absolute com-

[22] Ludlow, vol i. pp. 171, 175, &c. [23] Rapin, vol. ii. pp. 527, 537, 566.

mand of the deliberations of that assembly, and that in the conclusion of the year 1648 the Independents, supported by the army, effected the expulsion of the presbyterian members, and exclusively constituted the house.

The execution of the sovereign, which occurred early in the year 1649, was a direct consequence of the ascendency of the Independents and the army. But it has been truly observed[24], that nothing contributed more powerfully to the re-establishment of his family, than his own untimely and violent death. The sympathies of the nation were strongly affected by this extraordinary example of suffering; a moral action of a generous nature was excited in the bosoms of those, who had contemplated the mere fall from power with indifference; and a disposition to lament and to restrain the excesses of faction was suddenly created by this very striking exhibition of the violence, to which they conducted. The impression was made more profound by the publication of the Εικων Βασιλικη[25], which has been eloquently compared by Milton to the testament of Cæsar[26], but the reverential admiration of the portraiture of a good king was a consideration far superior to the mercenary gratitude and tumultuary emotion of the Roman populace.

When the popular part of the government had been enabled to overthrow the monarchy, the aristocracy could not long be permitted to subsist, and it was accordingly suppressed within the same year[27]. In erecting the high

[24] Laing, vol. i. p. 384. [25] Whether this work, which was published in the name of the king a few days after his execution, had been written by him, or by Doctor Gauden, has been, and still is, strenuously contested. Doctor Wordsworth has lately concluded in favour of the king, and Mr. Hallam in favour of Doctor Gauden.

[26] Hume, vol. vii. p. 163. [27] This seems to have been assisted by the negligence of the peers themselves, whom Cromwell wished to support. 'The house of lords,' says Ludlow, vol. i. p. 246, 'becoming now the subject of the consideration and debate of the parliament, lieutenant-general Cromwell appeared for them, having already had a close correspondence with many of them, and it may be, presuming that he might have further use of them in those designs he had resolved to carry on. But they not meeting in their house at the time to which they had adjourned, much facilitated their removal: so that the question being put, whether the house of commons should take advice of the house of lords in the exercise of the legislative power, it was carried in the negative, and thereupon resolved, that the house of peers was useless and dangerous, and ought to be abolished.'

court of justice for the trial of the king the consent of the lords had been pronounced unnecessary; and, when they desired a conference with the commons to provide for the administration of justice, the commissions of the judges having been determined by the death of the king, the latter, without replying to the message, voted that their assembly was useless, and ought to be abolished. All, except three, rejecting the permission of becoming members of the house of commons[28], the constitution was left destitute of its aristocratic order. The house of commons itself had sustained a considerable diminution both of number and of importance by the successive exclusions of the Royalists and the Presbyterians; and thus the parliament, which at its commencement was composed of a hundred and twenty-four peers and five hundred and thirteen commoners, was at this time reduced to about eighty persons of the latter description, possessing very inconsiderable property.

In the struggle of the English parties, the Presbyterians maintained the ascendency from the commencement of the war in the year 1642 to the year 1647, in which the army brought the parliament into subjection. From this time the army, or the Independents, governed six years through the intervention of the parliament. During seven years more a

[28] Hallam's Constit. Hist. vol. ii. p. 319. Of the temporal peers fifty-three names appear in the parliament of 1454, the last held before the commencement of the great contest between York and Lancaster. Henry VII. summoned only twenty-nine to his first parliament, and the number in his reign never much exceeded forty. The greatest number summoned by Henry VIII. was fifty-one, which continued to be nearly the average in the two next reigns, and was very little augmented by Elizabeth. James made so many new peerages, that eighty-two peers sat in his first parliament, and ninety-six in his latest. Charles called no less than one hundred and seventeen peers to the parliament of 1628, and one hundred and nineteen to that of November 1640. In the parliament of 1661, we find one hundred and thirty-nine lords summoned.—Ibid., vol. iii. pp. 46—48. After the violent seclusion of the constitutional party from the house of commons, on the sixth of December, 1648, very few, not generally more than five peers, continued to meet. Their number was suddenly increased to twelve on the second of January, when the vote of the commons, that it is high treason in the king of England to levy war against the parliament, and the ordinance constituting the high court of justice, were unanimously rejected. From this time the number varied from four to six. —Ibid., vol. ii. p. 317.

temporary monarchy was established in the person, first of Oliver Cromwell, and then of his son Richard. The whole interval accordingly between the commencement of the civil war and the restoration of the royal family, appears to have been distributed into three nearly equal portions, among the two great parties of the English oppositionists, and that military usurpation, by which they were at length instructed in the impracticability of their plans, and disciplined to a spirit of mutual accommodation[29].

The Independents, though their principles were more of an extreme character than those of the Presbyterians, were however, as a religious sect, not ill fitted for acquiescing after some time in the re-establishment of the ancient system of religion and policy. As it was their fundamental doctrine, that every religious congregation was independent of every other, toleration was their proper characteristic[30]. Even the re-establishment of episcopacy was not viewed by them with any considerable jealousy; and, though a republic was naturally more agreeable to those who were republicans in religion, so loose and unsystematic were their habits, that they were without much difficulty disposed to coalesce with the general mass of the public, when the Presbyterians had been at length induced to form a junction with the Royalists.

The house of commons, which thus usurped the whole authority of the government, had been itself reduced to about eighty members, and in this diminished state was almost wholly dependent on the army. In this condition it was

[29] The power of Cromwell was also usefully exercised in crushing a party of levellers, which soon appeared in the army.—Rapin, vol. ii. p. 540. [30] The Independents forgot this principle in New England, but there their congregations did not sufficiently adhere to independency, acting too much as a body.—Hallam's Constit. Hist., vol. ii. p. 276. Mr. Hallam is of opinion, that the Arminians may contest with the Independents the honour of having first maintained the cause of toleration.—Introd. to the Literature of Europe, vol. iii. pp. 103, &c. The first famous plea, in England, in favour of toleration was the Discourse on the Liberty of Prophesying, published by Jeremy Taylor in the year 1647. This was succeeded by the treatise of Grotius De Jure Summorum Principum circa Sacra, published in the year 1661; by Bayle's Commentaire Philosophique, sur ces paroles de Jesus Christ, contrainez-les d'entrer, published in the year 1686; and by Locke's Six Letters upon Toleration, the first of which appeared in the year 1689.—Hist. Memoirs by Butler, vol. i. p. 387.

driven to the necessity of adopting some expedient for reinforcing its strength. This they chose to effect by permitting the former members to resume their places, on the condition of subscribing an engagement[31], by which it was supposed that the Royalists and the more rigid Presbyterians would be excluded. That the constitution recovered itself from its aberration into democracy by the intrinsic vigour of its principles, seems to be confirmed by the determination of this remnant of a parliament not to appeal to the people, by issuing writs for new elections, to fill the vacant places, though at the hazard of permitting many of their adversaries to return. With the same apprehension of the failure of popular support, they also declined to refer to a jury and to the ordinary tribunal the trial of some persons of distinction[32].

Cromwell, by whom this new government was overthrown at the close of about four years, had been detained at home[33], by an order of council, eleven years before, together with Hampden and Haselrigge, two celebrated opponents of the crown, when they were preparing to sail for New England, that they might enjoy in another region their favourite puritanism. The earliest intimation of the ambitious design[34], which he afterwards conceived, seems to have been imparted to Ludlow, when the king was delivered up by the Scotish army. But it is probable that he might never have been able to accomplish his usurpation[35], if Ireland and Scotland had not presented fields of action, in which he could acquire the glory and the influence of a conqueror. The wars indeed of both these countries influenced the agitations of England through their entire progress. The war of Ireland first afforded to the parliament an occasion of taking from the crown the command of the army: it then served to encourage, and also by his negotiations with the Roman Catholics of that country[36], to discredit the king: and it at last afforded Crom-

[31] Those who subscribed it, rejected all concessions made by the king, approved of all the proceedings against him, and engaged themselves to be true and faithful to the commonwealth, as established without king or house of lords. Many of the moderate Presbyterians signed it, and resumed their seats in the parliament.—Rapin, vol. ii. p. 575.
[32] Ibid., p. 574. [33] Neal, vol. ii. p. 316. [34] Ludlow, vol. i. pp. 160, 163. [35] Villemain, tome i. p. 274. [36] The articles of the negotiation of the earl of Glamorgan with the confederate Irish were found on the titular archbishop of Tuam, who had been slain by

well an opportunity of attaining, by the reduction of those Roman Catholics, an importance necessary to the usurpation, which he effected in England. Scotland on the other hand in two invasions supported the parliament against the crown; in a third, undertaken for the support of the crown, promoted eventually the advancement of Cromwell: and finally by its subjugation it co-operated with Ireland to invest that usurper with an importance, which overpowered the parliament.

When Charles had, in the year 1642, fought with the forces of the parliament the indecisive battle of Edgehill, he judged it expedient to accept the services of the Roman Catholics of Lancashire[37], and was soon led to speculate on the probability of drawing succours from those of Ireland to oppose the Scots, whom the parliament then invited to their assistance. The Irish insurgents had repeatedly solicited permission to lay their grievances before the king[38], but were withstood by the lords justices, who saw in the continuance of the insurrection a rich harvest of confiscation. Their petition however at length reached the throne, and the marquess of Ormond, agreeably to the command of the king, entered into a negotiation for a cessation of arms, when he had first ascertained, that means could not be provided for a further prosecution of the war. After some opposition from an agent of the pope a treaty was concluded[39]; but all the advantage received from it by the king, was that it permitted him to withdraw from Ireland a part of his own forces, the confederates refusing to suffer troops, arms, or ammunition, to be sent for the royal service, in the persuasion that Charles might yet be reduced to purchase their assistance by some liberal concessions. The treaty might perhaps afterwards have been conducted to a more satisfactory conclusion by the marquess[40], if the king had not at the same time reposed his confidence also in another agent, created earl of Glamorgan, and thus embarrassed his own measures by the duplicity of his conduct. It was however yet more powerfully impeded by the interposition of Rinnuccini[41], a papal nuncio, who animated the confederates to stipulate for the most ex-

the Scots at the siege of Sligo. The negotiation was disavowed by Charles, but has been fully established by Laing, vol. i. pp. 308, 309.

[37] Whitelocke, p. 62. [38] Leland, vol. iii. pp. 191, 192, 203—206.
[39] Ibid., pp. 208, 217. [40] Ibid., p. 247. [41] Ibid., p. 256.

travagant conditions[42]. A reinforcement was at last, in the year 1646[43], promised to the marquess of Ormond, who in regard to religion consented only, that Roman Catholics should not be required to swear the oath of supremacy; but the negotiation had been protracted, until the affairs of the king had been ruined, and the promised aid could no longer be useful. This convention was indeed opposed by the nuncio, and two years afterwards the marquess was induced to comply with almost all the demands of the Roman Catholics[44]. Charles however had perished on the scaffold, before the intelligence of the new treaty was conveyed to London. A severe chastisement was inflicted on the bigotry, which had withheld the expected assistance, Cromwell being sent by the parliament to reduce to obedience the Irish Roman Catholics. He was indeed within a year recalled to England by the apprehension of an invasion of the Scots, but the conquest was in the year 1651 completed by his lieutenants.

If the clergy of the Roman Catholics had permitted the moderate party of their church to yield to the representations of the marquess of Ormond, and engage heartily in the support of the royal cause, it is possible that they might have enabled the king, or his son, to recover the throne by arms, which must have been ruinous to freedom; it is certain that a much more obstinate civil war, exasperated by the utmost violence of religious dissension, would have been waged between the contending parties, which must have produced effects very different from those of the usurpation, by which all men found themselves alike deceived in their expectations, and were thus alike disposed to a re-establishment of the ancient order. The ruin too, which their disloyalty drew down upon their own party, was conducive to

[42] The treaty of the earl of Glamorgan, conceded to the Roman Catholics all which could be required for the most ample toleration; but the nuncio objected, that it contained no mention of a Roman Catholic lord-lieutenant, no provision for Roman Catholic bishops and universities, no stipulation for a continuance of the supreme council or government of the confederates—Leland, vol. iii. pp. 256, 264.

[43] Ibid., pp. 280, 281.

[44] All the penal statutes were to be repealed, and the Roman Catholics were secured in the possession of those churches which they then held, until the pleasure of the king should be freely and authentically declared.—Ibid., pp. 364, 365.

the orderly restoration of the government of England, as it withdrew from the king all hope of recovering the throne by their assistance.

Scotland, which had sent its third army into England in support of Charles I., acknowledged the royal dignity of the son immediately after the execution of the father. This tardy loyalty, though not capable of effecting the restoration of the young prince, had however an important operation, as it determined him to decline the invitations, with which the marquess of Ormond urged him to repair to Ireland, and try his fortune in that country. It also brought upon Scotland the vengeance of the parliament, and thus, while by the splendour of military success it contributed to the aggrandisement of Cromwell, effectually removed the Scots also from all interference with the settlement of England.

Four years after the execution of the king, and two after the reduction of Ireland and Scotland, Cromwell, having found among his friends no encouragement to assume the royal dignity[45], dissolved the long parliament, and took upon himself the direction of the government, though without any other formal character than that of the lord-general. His ambition at this time proposed an inferior object, which however appeared to be unattainable during the continuance of a parliament[46]. The minds of the people still requiring to be prepared for the new form of government, Cromwell had recourse to an extraordinary convention of a hundred and thirty-nine persons, selected by himself and a council of military officers, but for England with a reference to the proportion of taxation in the several counties[47]. This convention, which may be denominated an assembly of *notables*, seems to have been employed to alarm the two great interests of the law and the church into an acquiescence in the advancement of Cromwell[48], being urged to engage in very decisive measures of reformation for both departments. When it had done its work, its dissolution was so contrived as to appear a voluntary resignation of its power in a conviction of its own incompetency; and the protectorate, for

[45] Parl. Hist., vol. xx. pp. 80, 104. [46] Ibid., pp. 99, 130, 141.

[47] The Welsh, Irish, and Scotish members (six for Wales, as many for Ireland, and five for Scotland) appear to have been nominated by the government, without any reference to the divisions of counties.

[48] Parl. Hist., vol. xx. p. 240.

introducing which it had been assembled, was immediately assumed by Cromwell, who at the same time published a new constitution, vesting the government in himself and a parliament.

Cromwell has obtained credit for rejecting from his constitution the inconsiderable boroughs[49], and forming a

[49] Inconsiderable places have, from the earliest period of the history of the house of commons, sent representatives to that assembly. Fifty-one small towns of the royal demesne were at various times summoned by Edward I. to send their representatives, nor was any objection made to this practice, because these attended only for the purpose of regulating the talliages due by their own towns and others of similar tenures. When these members had begun to act with the others in the general measures of the house of commons, it was discovered that this part of the representation might be rendered useful to the government, and the number of inconsiderable places represented in the parliament was gradually increased, especially in Cornwall, where the crown had, on account of the duchy, the greatest influence.—Parl. Hist., vol. xxi. pp. 212, &c. The notion of parliamentary reform appears to have originally presented itself to James I., who, in summoning his first English parliament directed the sheriffs not to address their precepts to any borough so decayed, that there were not 'sufficient resyants to make such choice, and of whom lawfull election may be made.' The monarch appears however to have been satisfied with having thus delivered a lecture on a constitution, which he could not have understood, for not only all the former boroughs were retained in the representation, but many inconsiderable places were at that very time introduced into it.—Moore's Hist. of the British Revolution, p. 326. London, 1817. The next reformer was Lilbourne, who in the year 1649 proposed that the representation should be distributed proportionally to the respective parts of the nation, and that none should be excluded from the right of election except servants, those who had received alms, and those who had served the late king either by arms, or by money.—Parl. Hist. vol. xix. pp. 111, &c. Cromwell's plan, while it excluded the small boroughs, differed essentially from that of Lilbourne, by excluding also from the right of voting in elections for counties every person not possessing property of the value of two hundred pounds.—Ibid., vol. xx. p. 255. The question was next agitated in the year 1679 by the earl of Shaftesbury as a measure of factious opposition. In the year 1770 lord Chatham, on account of the public discontents, proposed to augment the representation of the counties.—Anecdote of the earl of Chatham, vol. ii. p. 58. Dublin, 1792. The question was again revived in the year 1779 by the discontent excited by the administration of lord North; and Mr. Pitt, in the year 1785, proposed to transfer to the counties the representation of thirty-six small boroughs.—Bp. Tomline's Life of Pitt, vol. i. pp. 51, 450. London, 1821. In the mean time doctor Jebb, and after him Mr. Cartwright, brought forward the principle of personal representation,

fair and free representation of the people; but such a constitution of the legislature had been previously devised by the long parliament among its latest operations[50]. The object of the usurper was to reconcile the independent spirit of the people to the acknowledgment of his own power. The enterprise proved however too difficult even for the ability of Cromwell. He soon discovered that he had constructed a government, over which he could not exercise a sufficient control[51], and that all the success of his crafty ambition had but constituted his life the single impediment opposed to the re-establishment of the legitimate monarchy. Sickening at the personal danger[52], to which he stood exposed, he was blasted in the midst of his greatness, and sunk into the tomb.

The new parliament, the first united legislature of the three countries[53], was assembled in the year 1654, and immediately proceeded to examine the power[54], by which it had been convened. Alarmed at this display of independence, Cromwell compelled the members, before they could obtain permission to return to their house, to sign a recognition of his authority. The parliament nevertheless persisted from day to day, and from month to month, during the five months of its appointed continuance[55], in dis-

or universal suffrage: and at length, in the agitation of the French revolution, a society entitled the Friends of the People, presented a petition, which, says lord John Russell, was no less than a bill of indictment against the constitution.— Essay on the Hist. of Engl. Gov. and Const., p. 241. The whole system of the representation has been altered by an act passed in the year 1832, the object of which was to suppress close, or nomination boroughs.

[50] Parl. Hist., vol. xx. p. 121.

[51] By this constitution the protector possessed no negative on the proceedings of the parliament, nor the power of dissolving it within five months; he shared with it, or in the intervals of its sessions with the council, the command of the militia; and he was in the like manner controlled in regard to the selection of the principal officers of his government.—Ibid., pp. 248, &c.; pp. 364—369.

[52] The apprehension of assassination, by which he was latterly tortured, may be believed to have been caused chiefly by the celebrated pamphlet, intitled Killing no Murder, dedicated to him by colonel Titus.

[53] The number of members for England and Wales was four hundred; twenty-one represented Scotland, and thirty Ireland. It had been ordained that Scotland should, like Ireland, be represented by thirty, but twenty-one only were returned.—Ibid., pp. 248—307.

[54] Ibid., p. 348.

[55] It has been said that Cromwell anticipated

cussing the several regulations, prescribed in the instrument of government, which he had promulgated, contenting itself however with determining that the protectorate should be elective[56], the election to be made by the parliament, or in the interval of two sessions by the council. Weary of the refractory spirit which he had found in this first parliament, Cromwell governed about nine months with the assistance only of his council. Being then encouraged by an unsuccessful insurrection of the Royalists to seek a resource in the confiscation of a tenth[57] part of the properties of the insurgents, he divided England into twelve districts, over each of which he placed a major-general to superintend this exaction, and also to manage a general system of espionage and police.

A war with Spain, which Cromwell commenced at this time, apparently in the hope of obtaining by plunder those supplies[58], for which he was unwilling to resort to a parliament, drove him by its expensiveness to the adoption of that very measure[59], and his major-generals, when they had discharged the necessary function of influencing the elections[60], were dismissed from their office[61], having become, not only hateful to the nation, but also formidable to the protector. It was soon however discovered that all the influence[62], which they had exercised, had not been sufficient to procure a parliament, on which the protector could securely depend; and it was therefore determined that no man should be permitted to take his seat in it, who should not have received from the council of state a certificate of approbation. Even with this precaution the assembly proved hostile to his interest[63], and after a little more than a year and four months was in its turn abruptly dissolved.

the appointed time of the dissolution by adopting a military mode of calculation, which allows to each month only twenty-eight days; but this is stated by Blackstone to be the legal length of a month, unless otherwise expressed. [56] Parl. Hist., vol. xx. pp. 388, 403, 404. [57] Ibid., pp. 433, 461, &c. [58] Ibid., p. 477. [59] Ibid., vol. xxi. p. 1. [60] Ibid. [61] Ibid., vol. xx. p. 469; vol. xxi. p. 53. [62] Ibid., vol. xxi. p. 2. [63] It passed a hurried bill, declaring that the determination of the session should not be a consequence of his acceptance of the bills then presented, which bill was to be first offered for his acquiescence. The Spanish

Notwithstanding the hostility of this other parliament Cromwell twice attempted to raise himself to the throne by its assistance[64], possibly because he had discovered in the preceding the insufficiency of the protectoral authority, and had since discovered also, that he could not safely rely on merely military power. The earlier proposal of this measure was at once rejected by the house; but, when it was again submitted, it was very favourably received, the Royalists, it has been concluded[65], encouraging the scheme, to favour the restoration of the legitimate monarch. The protector hesitated more than two months to declare his acceptance of the much-desired dignity, apparently that he might ascertain the sentiments of all parties, before he should reveal his own. He was then compelled by an unexpected remonstrance of the army[66], to declare that he must withhold his consent.

The plan of a royal government being thus abandoned by the protector, the Royalists proposed so to regulate that of the protectorate, as to embarrass the protector. In this scheme[67], comprehending seventeen articles, it was arranged that the parliament should in future consist of two houses, one to be composed of members elected by the people, the other of persons nominated by the protector with the approbation of the existing parliament; that no person elected to serve in the former should be excluded except by its judgment, nor any new member be admitted into the latter without its consent; and that no article should be valid, unless all were ratified. By these provisions the protector was entangled in difficulties. By their operation about a hundred of the most inveterate enemies of Cromwell[68], who had been excluded by the want of the approbation of his council, were introduced into the new house of commons; the other house also became then an object of jealousy to that assembly[69], in which the interest

war soon afterwards requiring supplies, these were voted for a purpose so popular, but a resolution of the house at the same time asserted the rights of the people, by pronouncing that no money should be levied without common consent in parliament.—Parl. Hist., pp. 42, 56.

[64] Ibid., vol. xxi. pp. 57, &c. [65] Ibid., pp. 127, 128.

[66] Ibid., p. 122. [67] Ibid. pp. 129. &c. [68] Ibid., pp. 194, 195. [69] To constitute this house sixty-three persons were summoned by writs. Eleven of these were peers; but one peer alone, the

of the protector had been at the same time weakened, by removing from it to the other some of his ablest agents. It being now manifest that the new frame of the constitution would not work, foreign invasion and domestic conspiracy at the same time menacing the public peace[70], the usurper hastily terminated his parliament, concluding his address with these remarkable words, 'Let God judge between me and you,' to which many of the commons replied 'Amen.'

Seven months after this appeal to the great judge of all men, Cromwell was summoned by death to render his account. The short interval was ennobled by the successes of the national arms, Jamaica and Dunkirk being taken from the Spaniards; but the agitations of his perilous condition overcame the natural vigour of his constitution, and he perished by a slow fever, the result of mental anxiety. He was immediately succeeded by his son Richard, whom he was said to have designated[71], though there is reason for believing that he had really nominated Fleetwood.

Richard assembled a parliament to provide for sending a fleet into the Baltic[72], agreeably to an engagement by which his father had bound himself to support Sweden against Denmark. That he might avoid the opposition, which his father had experienced, he summoned the members of the house of commons agreeably to the ancient practice, summoning two members from each borough, and including in the representation the inconsiderable boroughs. It was still however found impracticable to reconcile the commons to the existence and authority of the new house of lords, which they contemptuously persisted in distinguishing only by the appellation of 'the other house.' The time of the former assembly was accordingly so engrossed by the altercations[73], which this jealousy occasioned, that no measures were adopted for providing for the public exigencies, nor even for the payment of the army, which was itself divided into parties, all eager to have the direction of the government. At length, when the parliament had been assembled little more than two months, the pro-

lord Eure, attended; and Sir Arthur Haselrigge, though summoned to it, chose to take his seat in the house of commons as a member for Leicester.—Parl. Hist. vol. xxi. pp. 167, 169. [70] Ibid., pp. 202—205.
[71] Ibid., pp. 226, 227. [72] Ibid., pp. 245, 246. [73] Ibid., pp. 339, 351.

tector found himself necessitated to communicate to it a representation of a general council of the officers of the army, and shortly afterwards to dissolve it on a promise[74], that care should be taken of his personal interest.

This revulsion of the government, though in the natural order of events, appears to have been much facilitated by the extraordinary imprudence[75], with which Richard Cromwell had permitted a military council to be held, while the parliament was assembled, thus opposing by his own authority the army to the legislature. Secure however in his unimportance[76], the protector sunk quietly into private life from an elevation, which he had held about eight months, and lived to the reign of the fourth of the sovereigns, by whom he was succeeded. The expedients even of the father seem to have been exhausted, and the position, in which he had placed himself, to be no longer tenable by any ability; but the inoffensive weakness of the son so mitigated the violence of party, that the dangerous descent from power was to him a path of safety.

Between the resignation of Richard Cromwell and the restoration of the king elapsed almost a year of doubtful and unsettled government, in which the most important agent was Monk, who at the time of the former of those events commanded the army in Scotland. This general, who appears to have been even then[77], together with admiral Montague, an object of suspicion to the republican party, was enabled to accomplish this important revolution in the most perfect tranquillity by an impenetrable dissimulation, which to the last moment perplexed his enemies, and even kept his friends in suspense. The army, which usurped the government, unable to find an individual capable of presiding over a military administration[78], was persuaded by the republican party to recall those members of the long parliament, whom itself had expelled in the year 1653. The jealousy long subsisting between the two bodies, was however too deeply seated in the difference of their constitutions, to be removed by the recent kindness of the army, and accordingly was again apparent, as soon as the restored parliament had begun to feel its power. Monk therefore, by professing

[74] Parl. Hist., vol. xxi. p. 355. [75] Ibid., p. 358. [76] Ibid., p. 362. [77] Ibid., p. 422. [78] Ibid., p. 362.

to be the devoted servant of the parliament, and ever ready to protect it against the efforts of its adversaries, was able to persuade it, jealous as it was of his intentions, to remove to a distance that army, by which it had been restored, and to commit itself wholly to his care. The crafty measures of Monk were completed by the policy[79], with which he excited against the parliament the discontent of the people of London, even marching as an enemy into the city, that he might afterwards throw upon the parliament the odium of orders, which himself had suggested. The king would doubtless have been restored without all this artifice, for the greater part of the people of England had become weary of the public agitations, and the interested speculations of ambition had betrayed the selfishness of fanaticism real or affected; but a falsehood, which no virtuous and honourable mind can approve, became the instrument of a peaceable adjustment[80], at which every friend of his country must rejoice, though he cannot bestow on the chief agent a higher title than that of the English Themistocles. The Royalists were seasonably hindered from disturbing the operations of Monk by an inconvenient activity in the cause, an insurrection of this party having been suppressed a short time before that general began his march from Scotland[81].

Cromwell, by leaving Monk to complete the reduction of Scotland, and to establish himself in that territory, unconsciously prepared the chief agent of the restoration of the king, placing him also in the situation most commodious for observing silently the progress of events. Originally a Royalist[82], though he afterwards engaged in the service of Cromwell, he was an object of expectation to the friends of Charles, and had reason to apprehend the suspicion of his enemies; and having been engaged in a rivalship with Lambert, whose jealousy was increased by his present authority, he could not hope to preserve his power, if the army in England should prevail. Such a situation would suggest caution to any man; Monk it inspired with the most extraordinary dissimulation.

[79] Parl. Hist. vol. xxii. pp. 107—110, 114—116. 161. [80] 'It is,' says Mr. Hallam, 'a full explanation of Monk's public conduct, that he was not secure of the army, chiefly imbued with fanatical principles, and bearing an inveterate hatred towards the name of Charles Stuart.' —Constit. Hist., vol. ii. p. 388. [81] Parl. Hist., vol. xxi. p. 441.

[82] Laing, vol. i. pp. 478, &c.

This dissimulation renders it even now difficult to determine[83], whether, when he first declared in favour of the parliament, he had already formed the project of effecting the restoration of the king, or whether he had not originally proposed to establish his own power by the assistance of the parliament, and afterwards yielded to the general tendency of the public opinion. Whatever was the real system of his conduct, he contrived by his reserve to hold the nation in suspense until the critical moment, when the re-establishment of the king and the constitution might be accomplished without opposition. Another consequence of this management was[84], that the king was restored to his throne without condition or limitation. But the constitution was not yet sufficiently matured for such stipulations, and to have imposed them at this time could but have embarrassed the subsequent operations of the government, which terminated in a more complete adjustment.

The chief agency of Scotland upon the triple government was at this time completed, and the reduction of that country[85] served to suppress in it that spirit of independence, which had performed its part, and would by its continuance have restrained and disturbed the influence of the contrary spirit, which prevailed in England in the succeeding period. The support of Ireland was to the crown in the succeeding period, what the support of Scotland had been to the parliament in the preceding, the Romish religion of the greater part of the people of the former connecting itself with the arbitrary views of the sovereign, as the presbyterian religion of the latter had been associated with the projects of the parliament. In preparation for this other period the Roman Catholics of Ireland experienced a severe depression, consequent on the part which they had taken in the preceding troubles. It may be concluded from the efforts previously made to establish a papal dominion in Ireland independent of the crown[86], that this experience was necessary for bringing the

[83] Laing, vol. i. pp. 481, &c. [84] 'A motion to consider on what conditions they should receive the king, was overruled by an artful declaration of Monk, that he was no longer responsible for the obedience of the army, or the public tranquillity, if a delay intervened.'—Ibid., vol. i. p. 484. [85] Ibid., p. 468. [86] For preparing fit agents in this plan foreign seminaries were established, in which the candidates for clerical offices were to be educated. The first of these was founded

Roman Catholics into that connexion with the crown, which gave occasion to the revolution.

In England the public commotions created a disposition to moderation and union among the agitating parties of the state. The Presbyterians were taught by their fear of the Independents, to repress their own anxiety for the exclusive establishment of their worship and discipline; and the Independents, on the other hand, were disciplined by the usurpation of Cromwell into a renunciation of their projects of republican government. In the progress however towards this conclusion energies were developed, fitted to invest the nation with distinction; and we accordingly find that England, while it was agitated at home by parties ecclesiastical and political, maintained an ascendency abroad, which rendered it formidable to all the neighbouring countries.

The commonwealth, before the usurpation of Cromwell, determined, under the influence of various motives[87], to engage in hostility with the Dutch republic, and with this view framed the celebrated act of navigation[88], which has multi-

at Douay in the year 1568; another at Rome in the year 1578; similar institutions were formed at Lisbon and Valladolid; and about the year 1598 was erected the college at St. Omer's. Father Peter Walsh has detailed the unqualified doctrine of papal supremacy, which was taught in these seminaries.—Dr. Phelan, p. 282. Though James II. was by his conversion freed from the disqualification of heresy, this would not have protected him against the extravagant pretensions of the Romish clergy of Ireland, if the party had not been enfeebled by the consequences of the restoration. [87] Many members of the parliament thought, that a foreign war would serve as a pretence for continuing the same parliament: others hoped that it would furnish a reason for maintaining a numerous army; some on the other hand expected that the great expense of naval armaments would prove a motive for diminishing the military establishment: to divert the attention of the public from domestic quarrels towards foreign transactions seemed also to be good policy: and lastly, the superior power of the English commonwealth, together with its advantages of situation, promised success against the Dutch, and encouraged the parliamentary leaders to hope, that the war might throw a lustre on their establishment, which was new and unpopular.—Hume, vol. vii. p. 224. [88] This act, passed in the year 1651, was in the year 1667 considerably modified in favour of the Dutch, who were then permitted to carry to England as their own produce, all the productions and manufactures of Germany and the Netherlands. By a law enacted in the year 1822 so

plied the commercial marine of England, and consequently has been the principle of its maritime greatness. A naval war accordingly raged during two years between the two republics, in which after the most violent efforts of both nations the superiority was conceded to the English[89]. When the Dutch contest had been honourably concluded by Cromwell, then protector, he looked round for another enemy, and resolved to encounter the force of the Spanish monarchy. For this he has been arraigned as acting contrary to the true interest of his country[90], in not supporting Spain against the dangerous ambition of France, and contrary to his personal interest, in not maintaining an exact neutrality, and avoiding to provoke foreign enemies. In reply to the former accusation it may be urged, that France had not then become the formidable government of Europe, but was the balancing power to the more formidable house of Austria; in reply to the latter, that the protector seems to have justly felt that some foreign enterprise was necessary to the stability of his dignity. The war against Spain was commenced with the acquisition of Jamaica, the great strength of the British dominion in the West-Indies. His other acquisition, Dunkirk, had no other influence, than as it brought discredit on the commencement of the reign of Charles II., who sold it to France.

We have been informed by Burnet[91], that the protector had proposed to himself, if he should succeed in assuming the royal dignity, to undertake a systematic protection of Protestants in all parts of the world. With this design he

many relaxations have been introduced in favour of the extension of commerce, that the principle of the original law has been almost abandoned, though in the preamble it is acknowledged, that on that principle 'the strength and safety of the kingdom do greatly depend.'

[89] Cromwell, in his war with Spain, exercised against the Dutch that right of search for the goods of an enemy, which was contested in the late war, and this even in the case of a ship of war.—Burnet, vol. i. p. 41. And also for English subjects on board the ships of strangers. —Life of James II., collected from his own Memoirs, vol. i. p. 290. Lond., 1816. [90] Hume, vol. vii. p. 268. [91] He resolved to set up a council for the protestant religion in opposition to the congregation *de propagandâ fide* at Rome, to consist of seven councillors and four secretaries, the world being distributed into four provinces. Chelsea, which had been erected as a college of controversy, was to be given to them.—Life of James II. vol. i. pp. 44, 45.

appears to have cultivated the alliance of the king of Sweden[92], and to have interposed with the king of France his powerful mediation in behalf of the Protestants of France and Piedmont. The project would however have embarrassed the political progress of Europe, as it would have introduced an ecclesiastical combination inconsistent with the relations, which policy required. In the great war of Germany, begun from a principle of religion, France had been introduced into a confederacy with the Protestants; and in a later period the house of Austria was leagued in the grand alliance with Great Britain and the Dutch republic against that kingdom. A political arrangement of Europe was projected by Elizabeth of England and Henry IV. of France, as a religious one was proposed by Cromwell. We can now perceive in the unfitness of both, how imperfect is our view of the present relations of the system, in which we are agents.

A protracted struggle in opposition to the government naturally produced writers, who advocated popular principles. We accordingly have the works of Algernon Sidney[93] and Harrington[94], with some prose compositions of Milton[95]. Hobbes however, who was on the other hand excited by it to defend the cause of monarchy against the people, is the only author of a new theory of society. Assuming, as his first principle, that the natural state of man is a state of war, in which all are equal[96], he inferred that power alone

[92] Villemain, tome ii. pp. 241—244. [93] This writer left a large treatise, which was published in the year 1698, under the title of Discourses on Government. It was, like that of Locke, written in answer to the *Patriarchæ* of Sir Robert Filmer, who had derived an arbitrary power to all kings from the patriarchal authority. [94] Of this writer we have several treatises, the most remarkable of which is the *Commonwealth of Oceana*, dedicated to Oliver Cromwell, when protector. He claimed as his own the discovery of the principle, that power follows the changes of property, conceiving that the troubles of his time arose chiefly from such a change, by which, from the time of Henry VII., the balance was inclining to the commons. [95] In these perhaps the only thing now worthy of notice, except the elegance of the latinity in a controversy with Salmasius, is that in his *Areopagitica*, a speech for unlicensed printing, he has suggested the expedient of double elections. [96] Those are equal, says he, who can equally hurt each other; but those who can do the greatest mischief, namely kill, can do equal hurt; therefore all men are by nature equal.—De Cive, cap. i. sect. iii. The fallacy consists in this, that all men are not

constituted right, and that to superior power accordingly men were bound to submit. It is remarkable that from the same notion of the equality of a state of nature Locke afterwards inferred the contrary doctrine, which founds all right of government in the popular consent. From this direct opposition of inferences we may be led to question that representation of the state of nature, in which they agreed. The natural state of man is that, in which the powers of his nature are best developed and exercised, not that in which savages or outcasts may be imagined to have casually existed. The origin of natural right should therefore be investigated in the social combinations of men, not in the forlorn condition of those, who have unhappily been thrown off from the cultivated society of their species. We should begin our systems of political philosophy, like Aristotle[97], with defining man to be a political animal, and proceed to infer from that nature, which fitted him for political society, that he was naturally subject to those obligations of duty, without which such a state of society could not be maintained.

The energy of mind, excited in such a struggle, would however produce effects extending far beyond the subject of contention. To this period of popular commotion must accordingly be referred the improvement of English versification; and it was also that of the genius, which imagined

equally able to do equal hurt. The doctrine of Hobbes is contained in two treatises; one composed in the Latin language, and entitled Elementa Philosophica de Cive, the other in English, and named *Leviathan*, a commonwealth being considered as a huge animal. It was not popular with the party of the king, for it favoured all existing power, and therefore maintained the cause of its adversaries, the former treatise having been published in the year 1646, and the latter in the year 1651. The system of Hobbes was elaborately answered by Bishop Cumberland, in his treatise intitled De Legibus Naturæ Disquisitio Philosophica, published in the year 1671, in which he maintains, that benevolence is naturally obligatory, and the principle of all our duties. Latterly it has been held, that the bishop has not been as successful in his argument, as he had been long considered, being named from it the Newton of morality. Mr. Carwithen, who remarks that Hobbes followed the second Charles into exile, and then, disgusted with the morals, or dissatisfied with the policy of the royalists, returned to England under the protectorate of Cromwell, states that *the Leviathan* was at first written in favour of absolute monarchy, but was afterwards modelled to suit the views of the republican party.—Hist. of the Church of England, vol. iii. p. 4. —Lond. 1833.

[97] Polit. lib. i. cap. 2.

and executed the most sublime of merely human compositions. Denham and Waller, says Prior[98], improved our versification, and Dryden perfected it. To Waller has been attributed sweetness[99], and strength to Denham, the author of the admired description of Cooper's Hill; to Dryden, who however flourished rather in the period succeeding the restoration, has been ascribed not only the merit of having completed the system of improved versification[100], which these writers had begun, but also that of having been in his prefaces the father of English criticism, and the praise of having produced in his poem[101] on Alexander's Feast, the noblest ode to be found in our, perhaps in any, language. His critical prefaces also are remarkable for the harmony, which they have given to English prose; but Mr. Hallam has[102] noticed Sir Thomas More's Life of Edward V. written about 1509, as the first example of good English prose composition. The great poem of Milton, with little assistance from the graces of diction, arrests our admiration by the grandeur of its conceptions. It sustains with dignity a plan, which has not only the noblest of created beings, but the Creator himself, among its characters, which has not only the whole universe for its scene, but also whatever can be imagined beyond its limits, and has for its subject the greatest interest of our entire species, extended even through everlasting duration. Milton was more especially the poet of a troubled time, from which the unyielding haughtiness of his character seems to have fitted him to receive all the

[98] Johnson's Lives of the Poets, vol. i. p. 76. Lond. 1792.

[99] Ibid., p. 277. [100] Ibid., pp. 386, 396, 416. [101] Dr. Johnson has given the preference to his poem on the death of Mrs. Killigrew; but Sir W. Scott has censured it as "mixed with the leaven of Cowley." Life of Dryden, pp. 415, 416. Edinb. 1834. Sir W. Scott, has concluded his life of Dryden with describing him as a man "destined, if not to give laws to the stage of England, at least to defend its liberties; to improve burlesque into satire; to free translation from the fetters of verbal metaphrase and exclude from it the license of paraphrase; to teach posterity the powerful and varied poetical harmony of which the language was capable; to give an example of the lyric ode of unapproached excellence; and to leave to English literature a name second only to those of Milton and of Shakespeare." Mr. Hallam denies to either of the two odes the pre-eminence ascribed to it, but without specifying any other as preferable or comparable. —Introd. to the Litt. of Europe, vol. iv. p. 437. [102] Ibid., vol. i. p. 621.

excitement, which it could supply. His *Comus* and his *Lycidas* were indeed produced before the commencement of the civil war; but his *Allegro* and *Penseroso* were given to the world in the midst of its contentions, in which he was himself deeply and earnestly engaged, and through the whole of its continuance he employed himself in meditating and composing that magnificent poem, for which he most appropriately supplicated the assistance of the Holy Spirit. He is supposed to have directed his mind more particularly to the composition of the *Paradise Lost* in the year 1655[103], when he had terminated his political controversies. Withdrawn then from the contentions of the age, and by his blindness shut in from all external objects, he brooded over his own sublime imaginations, and produced a poem, which has incorporated with the elegant literature of his country the purest sentiments of religion.

Science also claims its portion of the general excitement, for it was amidst that fermentation of talent, which was generated by the agitations of this interesting period, that those earlier meetings of the friends of philosophy were held[104], which were afterwards rendered permanent by a chartered incorporation. For[105] a somewhat earlier period Scotland, though remote from the scene of contention, boasts her Napier, the inventor of the logarithmic computation, which abridges and facilitates the calculations of the astronomer. Ireland, yet[106] unable to urge any pretension for scientific distinction, claims credit however for her Usher, as one of the greatest scholars of his age, and the first ornament of her recently established university.

[103] Johnson's Lives of the Poets, vol. i. p. 127. [104] The meetings, from which the Royal Society originated, commenced about the year 1645, a number of persons having then begun to assemble for the consideration of all subjects connected with experimental enquiries, questions of theology and policy being expressly precluded.—Harris's Life of Charles II., vol. i. p. 7. Lond., 1766. Mr. D'Israeli has traced the plan of such an association to the ideal institution described by Bacon in his philosophical romance, entitled Novus Atlas.—Curiosities of Literature, 2nd series, vol. i. p. 64. Lond. 1823.

[105] He died in the year 1617. [106] Boyle, one of the founders of the Royal Society, was born in Ireland, but at the age of eight years was removed to England.

CHAPTER XVII.

Of the history of Great Britain and Ireland, from the restoration in the year 1660 *to the accession of James II. in the year* 1685.

Charles II. restored and feudal tenures abolished, in the year 1660—The corporation-act, 1661—The act of uniformity, and in Ireland the act of settlement. 1662—The act of explanation in Ireland, 1665—The test-act, 1673—The prince of Orange married to the princess Mary, 1677—The Roman Catholics excluded from the parliament, 1678—The parties of Whigs and Tories formed, 1680—The Rye-house plot, 1683.

So general and earnest was the disposition to restore the royal government after the extravagancies of the commonwealth, that the restored prince[1] expressed a doubt, whether it was not his own fault, that he had been so long absent. In this state of the public mind it was not difficult for Monk to resist a proposal made by Hale[2], afterwards the celebrated chief-justice, of reviewing the negotiations, which had been carried on with the late king, and of preparing from them such conditions, as it might at this time be proper to propose. To the rejection of this proposal bishop Burnet has attributed all the errors of the restored prince; and another writer[3] has remarked that, if due limitations of the prerogative had been then established, the revolution perhaps might not have occurred. But, if the proposal of Hale had been adopted, what could it have availed, when the public feeling was not yet prepared for maintaining the restrictions, which it would have imposed? The due regulation of the great parties of the state was an indispensable preparation for the due adjustment of the constitution of the government; and to effect this it was necessary that the nation should have experienced the mischief of arbitrary power, as it had already experienced that of republican innovation.

The convention-parliament[4], which placed Charles II. on

[1] Clarendon, vol. iii. p. 772. [2] Burnet, vol. i. p. 50.

[3] Harris's Life of Charles II., vol. i. p. 347. [4] This parliament was assembled by writs, which had been issued by the long parliament, when Monk had procured a majority by restoring the excluded members. The writs had been issued professedly for constituting a govern-

the throne, had been too much concerned in the contest with his father, to give way to an undistinguishing censure of all, by whom he had been opposed. Hence it happened, and it is a memorable circumstance[5], that the right of resistance was maintained by the very body, by which royalty was re-established, a severe reprehension being ordered to be addressed to a member, who had asserted, that he who drew his sword first against the king, committed as great an offence, as he who cut off the king's head[6], and even payment being ordered of the arrears, due to those who had commanded the parliamentary armies. The same parliament introduced an important improvement of the constitution, for which however preparation had been made by the struggles of the preceding period[7]. During the interruption of the royal government the feudal claims of wardship had necessarily been suspended[8], and the possessors of land had thus become liable to intolerable forfeitures. These claims were accordingly abolished by the entire abrogation of the feudal tenures, from which they had resulted, a change begun in the year 1159 by Henry II. with the introduction of scutages, and thus at the expiration of five centuries completed by the convention-parliament. The excise at the same time, a revenue[9] first established by the long parliament to maintain the civil war, was settled on the crown[10], the one half in perpetuity as an equivalent for the emolument of wardships, the other during the life of the king.

When this parliament, composed chiefly of Presbyterians[11], had been dissolved, the prevailing sentiment of loyalty influenced the elections, and a parliament was formed, of which it was the characteristic. In a crisis so dangerous to the freedom of the government it most fortunately happened,

ment without any chief, or house of lords, Monk being at the same time appointed captain-general.—Parl. Hist., vol. xxii. pp. 140—147.

[5] Ibid., p. 287. [6] Harris, vol. i. p. 365. [7] In the year 1656 a bill had been ordered to be brought into the parliament for taking away the court of wards and liveries, and tenures by knight-service.—Parl. Hist., vol. xxi. p. 38. The change was indeed a direct result of the temporary republicanism of the government.

[8] Harris, vol. i. p. 397. [9] Supposed to have been adopted in imitation of the Dutch.—Sinclair's Hist. of the Revenue, vol. i. p. 46.

[10] Harris, vol. i. p. 404. [11] Somerville's Hist. of Polit. Trans. and of Parties, from the Restoration to the Death of King William, pp. 2, 3. Dublin, 1793.

that the earl of Clarendon possessed the confidence, and directed the counsels of the king. The moderation of that nobleman accordingly controlled the inconsiderate affection of the parliament[12], while his wisdom recommended the adoption of salutary laws, which had been introduced in the time of the republic. A regulation borrowed from the practice of that period, by which the power of taxing the clergy was transferred from the[13] convocation to the parliament, the parochial clergy being at the same time permitted to vote at elections of members of the house of commons, was an important improvement, as it simplified the machinery of the government.

The same distinguished minister, who was strongly attached to the established church, probably exercised his influence in promoting other arrangements[14], which very directly prepared the great crisis of the succeeding reign. The king, aware that he was to be restored by a junction of the Presbyterians with the Royalists, and desirous of extending some favour to the Roman Catholics, had in a declaration issued at Breda promised indulgence for differences in religious opinion. In the first parliament however, which he assembled, he discovered a disposition to a contrary policy, with which he found it expedient to concur. The disasters of the preceding period had impressed the Royalists very generally with a persuasion, that the interests of monarchy and episcopacy, which had then fallen together, were inseparably united: a suspicion of the inclination of the king to employ the proposed indulgence of protestant dissenters as an occasion favourable to the religion of Rome, to which he was known to be partial, inflamed their opposition: and the intemperate triumph of their own re-establishment, after a

[12] Burnet, vol. i. p. 91. [13] Sinclair's Hist. of the Revenue, vol. i. pp. 318, 319. The convocation was first summoned in the time of Edward I., for raising contributions from the inferior clergy, who had been exempted from the time, when William the Conqueror subjected the bishops and religious houses to knights' service. At the time of the reformation the subsidies of the convocation had begun to be confirmed by the parliament, that they might be enforced by temporal penalties; and at the same time it began to be convened for a twofold purpose, and by a twofold authority, by the crown for ecclesiastical business, and by the bishops for subsidies, agreeably to clauses in their respective writs.—Carwithen, vol. iii. pp. 107—109. [14] Somerville, p. 4.

long period of depression and distress, disposed them to disregard, notwithstanding their recent service, the pretensions of those, to whom they ascribed all their own past calamities. Two acts were accordingly passed, by which protestant dissenters were excluded from all civil corporations and ecclesiastical offices. By the corporation-act, passed in the year 1661, they were deprived of all opportunity of acquiring municipal privileges; and by a new and additional act of uniformity[15], presbyterian ministers were in the following year cut off from all connexion with the established church. Two[16] thousand are said to have found themselves compelled to abandon benefices, of which they were possessed. It deserves to be remarked, as characteristic of this first parliament of Charles II.[17], that in the act of uniformity was inserted an oath of non-resistance, which has however been since repealed.

In this manner was conducted the first period of the government of Charles II., which was concluded by the disgrace of Clarendon about seven years after the restoration. The king, having been urged by his people into a war with the Dutch[18], required of his parliament other supplies, be-

[15] The act of Charles required a declaration of unfeigned assent and consent to every thing contained in the book of common prayer, which had just before undergone a final revision. This act, it is observed by Carwithen, vol. iii. p. 82. emanated, not from the king, nor from the bishops, nor from the nobility, but from the house of commons.

[16] "The most eminent of the presbyterians in the records of science and literature, ultimately were induced to embrace the communion of the church."—Carwithen, vol. iii. p. 80. Wilkins, Ward, Cudworth, Lightfoot, Wallis, and Conant, have been particularised by this author.

[17] Harris's Life of Charles II., vol. ii. p. 94.

[18] "The nation in general approved of this war, from a jealousy of the Dutch encroaching upon our trade, and the resentment of injuries supposed to have been committed by them against the English East-India-Company. The selfish views of individuals had a considerable influence in promoting the first war with Holland. The duke of York, fond of military employment, viewed the injuries committed by the Dutch in aggravated colours, and incensed his brother against them.—Life of Clarendon, vol. ii. p. 14. The duke of Albemarle was piqued with the Dutch on account of personal affronts, which he had received while he served in their army, and flattered the court with an unbounded prospect of success by disparaging their military and naval force.—Life of James. The French invidiously fomented the quarrel, expecting that it would furnish them with a pretence for encroaching upon Flanders, by interfering in the war, either upon the side of Holland or England, as con-

yond a very liberal grant already voted for that purpose; the unexpected demand created in that body an opposition, sufficiently powerful to cause commissioners to be appointed for revising the public accounts; and the rivals and enemies of Clarendon easily found occasions and pretences for persuading the king, that by removing the minister he might free himself from embarrassment, and re-establish his authority. The administration thus terminated had exercised important influences on the government. The moderation and wisdom of Clarendon had reduced the state to order from the violent agitations of the preceding period; and the laws which he seems to have procured, for separating the episcopalian Protestants from the Presbyterians, had a direct operation in preparing the movements of the revolution.

By repelling the Presbyterians from the interest, which they had acquired in the ecclesiastical establishment and the corporations, they were formed into a party resolute to resist the arbitrary pretensions of the crown, though disciplined into moderation by their experience of the futility of their past enterprises against the constitution. By giving to the episcopalian Protestants on the other hand the exclusive possession of those advantages, they were disposed to indulge that extravagant loyalty, by the results of which they were afterwards practically instructed to seek in a temperate accommodation of opposite systems the reconciliation of order and freedom. If there had been no distinct party of Presbyterians, there would not have been a power in the people ready to vindicate the constitution. If the Episcopalians had not been disengaged from the Presbyterians, there would not have been a sufficient experience of the mischief of an excessive attachment to the interest of the crown. When this had been effected, the fall of Clarendon, freeing the king from the restraint of his presence and advice, left him at liberty to manifest all his desire of arbitrary power, and his brother to avow his adherence to the church of Rome.

For the entire development of the party attached to the

tingent events should direct.—Secret History of Europe, vol. i. The success of the English at sea in the beginning of the war, and their treaty with the bishop of Munster, determined the French to declare in favour of Holland.' Ibid.—Somervile, p. 8, note.

crown, it was necessary that it should be separated from the Presbyterians on the one hand, and on the other, that the government should be detached from the Roman Catholics, whom Charles II. was much inclined to favour [19]. The former operation, begun, as has been shown, by Clarendon, was completed by the test-law, enacted after his disgrace; the latter was afterwards effected by the alarm of the popish plot. When both had been accomplished, the loyalty of the Episcopalians was freed from all reserve, being moderated neither by an association with the Presbyterians, nor by a jealousy of the Roman Catholics.

In the year 1673, six years after the fall of Clarendon, we find in the parliament a steady opposition [20], excited by a jealousy of the conduct of the court in regard to the Roman Catholics. The test-law was accordingly enacted [21], the Presbyterians giving it their support, though to their own prejudice, that they might exclude the Roman Catholics from the confidence of the crown. A bill was indeed afterwards brought in for the relief of the former, but it was defeated by a disagreement of the two houses, and the consequent adjournment of the parliament, and the Presbyterians

[19] The house of commons in the year 1672, presented an address to the king, in which they not only complained of the increase of popish recusants, and of the great resort of priests and jesuits into the kingdom, but also represented that they were disheartened at seeing such popish recusants advanced into employments of great trust and profit, and especially into military commands.—Harris's Life of Charles II., vol. ii. p. 82. Both this prince and his brother James II. seem to have been predisposed to the religion of Rome in consequence of that article of the treaty of the marriage of Charles I., by which the queen, Henrietta of France, was to have the direction of the education of the children of the marriage, until they should attain the age of thirteen years.—Carwithen, vol. ii. p. 267. [20] In Ireland, where the protestant interest was weak, the test was imposed late, and early removed; the former in the year 1703, the latter in the year 1780. In England, the test-act was repealed in the year 1828. [21] The test-law required, as a qualification for all civil offices of trust that the sacrament of the eucharist should be received according to the form of the church of England, and that the doctrine of transubstantiation should be renounced. The duke of York, who had become a Roman Catholic in the year 1669, and had openly renounced the protestant religion in the year 1672, procured a provision to be inserted in the act, excepting himself from its operation.—Life of James II., from the original MSS. in Carleton House, vol. i. pp. 440, 630. Burnet, vol. i. pp. 245, 246.

remained subject to that disqualification, which they had assisted to impose upon the Roman Catholics.

When the jealousy of the Roman Catholics had served to complete the separation of the Presbyterians by giving birth to the test-law, they were themselves yet more effectually excluded from participation in the government by the pretended discovery of the popish plot. A charge of a plot to assassinate the king, massacre the Protestants, and place on the throne the duke of York, in subordination to the pope [22], brought forward in the year 1678, found in the fears of the people an abundant compensation for that real deficiency of evidence, which has caused it to be rejected by historians as a gross imposture. The king was forced to yield to the violence of the public opinion, and consent to the formal exclusion of Roman Catholics from both houses of the parliament of England. From this time accordingly a free opportunity was afforded to the episcopalian Protestants, to discover experimentally the mischievous tendency of that disposition, by which they were impelled to magnify the authority of the crown.

The king in the mean time employed every expedient for overthrowing at once the constitution and the religion of his country. That he might extricate himself from the control of his parliament, he had in the year 1668 entered into an ignominious negotiation, by which two years afterwards he became a pensioner of the French court [23], and then composed a confidential administration of five persons [24], which received the apt denomination of the *cabal*, a word formed of the initials of their respective designations. The resources of the king however proved insufficient for defraying the expenses of the government, when he had twice committed an act of bankruptcy by shutting his exchequer [25], and had

[22] Another plot, called the meal tub-plot, from the place where some papers belonging to it were found, was brought forward in the following year, but has been rejected by all historians. It was pretended that this was a plot of the Presbyterians. [23] The stipulated pension was two hundred thousand pounds. The king of France was also to assist the king of England with troops, if his subjects should rebel.—Somerville, p. 18, note. [24] Sir Thomas Clifford, the earl of Arlington, the duke of Buckingham, Ashley Cooper, earl of Shaftesbury, and the earl of Lauderdale. [25] The exchequer was shut up from the eighth of January, 1672, to the thirty-first of December in the same year, and again from the latter day to the sixth of May, 1673.—Somerville, p. 23, note. Hume has cal-

attempted to capture a rich fleet of the Dutch before any declaration of hostilities. He was accordingly in the year 1673 compelled to assemble his parliament, though in the long interval of its sessions he had offended the people by various acts of arbitrary power, particularly by publishing a declaration for liberty of conscience, and had excited the jealousy of the house of commons by causing the chancellor of the exchequer to issue writs by his own authority, for supplying the vacancies in that body. An opposition appeared as soon as the parliament had assembled, and a leader singularly qualified for animating and directing its efforts, speedily placed himself at its head.

The earl of Shaftesbury, endowed with all the qualities which could enable him to lead a party, was restrained by no principle from availing himself of every expedient for attaining his object[26]. Originally a royalist, he in the civil war attached himself to the parliament; he was after the restoration selected to be a member of that odious administration, which was named the *cabal;* and three years afterwards, when he had suggested to the king almost all the most violent measures of his government[27], he became the champion of the adverse party, probably alarmed by some indications of unsteadiness in the monarch[28], who had begun

culated the advantage gained by this transaction only at £1,200,000; but it appears from the interest paid for the money thus withheld, that the principal must have been £1,328,526. The interest was paid until about a year before the death of the king. It was then suspended during twenty-five years, after which time the half of the original debt was charged upon the hereditary revenue, so that the total loss sustained must have been about 2,800,000.—Sinclair's Hist. of the Revenue, vol. i. pp. 314. 315, 397—399.

[26] Shaftesbury, said the king to him, when he filled the office of chancellor, you are the greatest rogue in the kingdom. I am of any subject, replied the chancellor.—Somerville, p. 33. Mr. Fox, who seems to have regretted that he could not represent him as a true patriot, and contends that he was very far from being the devil he is described, acknowledges that he was very destitute of public virtue, and espoused with indifference monarchical, arbitrary, or republican principles, as best suited his ambition.—Hist. of James II., postscript to his preface. Lond., 1808.

[27] He has been by later writers acquitted of shutting the exchequer, which appears to have been proposed by lord Clifford.

[28] It is probable that his alarm was occasioned chiefly by the unsteadiness of the king in regard to the writs. It is asserted that, when the new writs were issued by the speaker, he refused for some days to seal them, declaring it to be an

to shrink from the enforcement of his counsels. His ardour long supplied the place of principle in maintaining his credit, his followers forgetting his past versatility in his present vehemence.

In the prudent and moderate conduct of the opposition in the new parliament the influence of the political experience of the nation is plainly discoverable. The commons complied with the desire of the king in the choice of a speaker; they unanimously voted a liberal supply for the relief of his necessities; and they addressed him in the language of the most loyal and affectionate attachment. They were not however backward in resisting the arbitrary measures of the king. They excluded the members returned upon the writs irregularly issued by the chancellor of the exchequer, and remonstrated boldly against the declaration of indulgence, which the king had professed himself determined to maintain. This firm moderation disconcerted the *cabal*. Shaftesbury, its most able member, attached himself to the rising party, and commenced a systematic opposition to the ministry, which was indeed overpowered at the end of ten years, but was soon afterwards renewed with recovered energy, to bear a part in the public deliverance.

In the course of the opposition, thus maintained against the crown, a lasting and most valuable improvement was introduced[29], by the enactment of the law known by the name of the act of *habeas corpus*. The long parliament had abolished the courts, which exercised a formally arbitrary jurisdiction; the present restrained the constitutional tribunals from the arbitrary exercise of their acknowledged powers. A modification of this restriction was however required, because the exercise of an arbitrary power of imprisonment must occasionally become necessary to the public safety. This further improvement was afterwards introduced by William[30], by obtaining from the parliament a temporary suspension of its operation.

intrenchment upon prerogative; and when he was obliged to do it by his majesty's positive command, he went home, and turned his back upon the sealers.—Somer's Tracts, vol. vii. p. 370. Lond., 1750.

[29] This act however was not scrupulously observed until the revolution had given its sanction to the rights and liberties of the people.—Life of Lord W. Russell, by Lord John Russell, vol. i. p. 164. Lond., 1820. [30] Somerville, p. 343.

The commentator of the laws of England[31] has indeed remarked, that we may distinguish the year 1679, as the precise time in which the constitution attained its theoretical perfection, though those which immediately succeeded, were times of great practical oppression. The abolition of the feudal tenures, which freed the estates of subjects from the incumbrances of the ancient vassalage, and the act of *habeas corpus*, which ensured protection to their persons, he considered as together constituting a second charter, as beneficial, and as effectual, as that obtained at Runnemede; and the year 1679 he selected, because the latter of these regulations had then been adopted, and the act for licensing the press[32] had expired. Mr. Fox[33] has from this state of the government, perfect in theory and in practice oppressive, drawn the conclusion which would naturally present itself to a man, who has passed his life in struggling for power, that men are more important than measures. A juster inference may be made in remarking, that mere laws, however perfect, are not sufficient for constituting a good government, but that it is also necessary that the sentiments and

[31] To the advantages mentioned in the text, the writer says he may add 'the abolition of the prerogatives of purveyance and pre-emption; the statute for holding triennial parliaments; the test and corporation acts, which secure both our civil and religious liberties; the abolition of the writ *de hæretico comburendo;* the statute of frauds and perjuries, a great and necessary security to private property; the statute for distribution of intestates' estates; and that of amendments and *jeofails*, which cut off those superfluous niceties, which so long had disgraced our courts; together with many other wholesome acts that were passed in this reign, for the benefit of navigation and the improvement of foreign commerce.' And from the whole he concludes, that the people had at this time from the laws sufficient power for asserting their liberties, if invaded by the royal prerogative; as was proved at the revolution.—Blackstone's Comm., book iv. ch. xxxiii. To this it may be added that, in the same period, lord Nottingham (Finch) began, as lord chancellor, the systematic formation of that law of equity, which the altering necessities of the people had begun to demand.—Lives of the Lord Chancellors, by Lord Campbell, vol. iii. pp. 424, 425. [32] The act had passed in the year 1662, having been copied, with some few alterations, from the parliamentary ordinances, which had been themselves taken from the practice of the suppressed court of star-chamber. It was revived in the first year of James II., and continued till 1692. It was then continued for two years more; but from 1694 the press has been free.—Ibid., ch. xi. note. [33] Hist. of James II., p. 22.

habits of the people and the combinations of parties should be accommodated to them. It seems however to have been a peculiar felicity of the English government, that the improvement of the laws preceded the adjustment of parties, so that, when the latter was afterwards effected, the improved system of the laws was ready for immediate operation.

From the struggle at this time maintained arose in the year 1680 the first formal division of the two parties[34], distinguished by the appellations of Whigs and Tories, the former taken from the Presbyterians of Scotland, the latter from the Roman Catholic banditti of Ireland[35]. These designations, given at first in derision, but afterwards adopted as proper appellations, indicate the quarters, from which the two parties disposed to control, or to magnify the power of the sovereign, had originally received, or expected support. Though time and experience moderated the principles of both parties, they continued to subsist in vigour more than a century, until the revolution of France, by developing principles of a more violent character, gave a shock to the Whigs of England, from which they recovered slowly and with difficulty. The reaction of popular excitement has however in the present day brought forward the party in all its former energy.

The opposition, which at this time resisted the measures of the crown, gave occasion to a systematic corruption, which was practised on the part of the crown without shame or reserve[36]. The intrigues of France on the other hand corrupted the opposition, and converted into a faction, which we are compelled to censure, that which might else have been honoured in the annals of our government as a band of patriots. The king, in the expectation of recovering the declining affections of his subjects, had been induced to consent that his niece, the daughter of the duke of York, should be married to his nephew the prince of Orange.

[34] Hume, vol. viii. p. 132. [35] The name was originally applied to the remains or descendants of the plunderers of the Irish war, who had concealed themselves in the bogs or mountains of Ireland.—Leland, vol. iii. p. 475. [36] Somerville, pp. 39—72. Lord Danby is said to have increased the sum allowed for corrupting members of parliament from 12,000*l.* to 20,000*l.*—Life of Lord W. Russell, vol. i. p. 152.

This alliance co-operated with a general apprehension of the irresolution of the English monarch, to determine the king of France to seek, in a secret intrigue with the opposition[37], some security against the danger, that he might be persuaded to yield to the prevailing sentiment of the nation, which was favourable to the Dutch. The opposition on the other hand was placed in a situation peculiarly embarrassing, which disposed it to listen to the overtures of a foreign prince. Deprived of all confidence in their sovereign, the persons opposed to his government were afraid to intrust him with the army, which would be necessary for hostility against France; and aware of his disgraceful and mischievous connexion with that country, they were themselves induced to enter into a connexion with the same government, by which his machinations against their religion and liberty might most effectually be counteracted and defeated.

This double intrigue rendered the measures both of the court and of the opposition more violent[38], and accelerated the crisis of the constitution. The king, in his reliance on the pecuniary aid of France, was encouraged to disregard the resistance of the parliament; and the opposition, involved in a similar engagement, was at length hurried to that extremity, which turned the affections of the nation, and for a time established the despotism of the crown.

It is a curious circumstance, that the leaders of the opposition were ruined, and their party discredited, in consequence of a vague connexion with another party[39], which,

[37] Barillon the French ambassador, in his report of the sums expended in this intrigue, has mentioned Sidney and Hampden as having received money from his sovereign. But it has been justly remarked that the agent was an interested witness, and that neither the character of Sidney, nor the property of Hampden, is consistent with such a statement.—Life of Lord William Russell, ch. x.

[38] Somerville, p 135. [39] 'If my opinion,' says lord John Russell, 'is well founded, there existed indeed both in the higher and lower orders, a great number of discontented persons: this discontent produced consultations on the state of the nation, and the practicability of resistance amongst the leaders, and wild talk about taking off the king and duke amongst indigent and unprincipled men. But there never was a formed plan, either for assassinating the king, or raising the country, except in the heads of Rumsey and West, and lord Howard and lord Grey.'—Life of Lord W. Russell, vol. ii. p. 148. Lord Russell has admitted that, at the desire of the duke of Monmouth, he went

without the concurrence or even privity of the former, concerted a scheme for assassinating the king and his brother. The discovery of this conspiracy, which from the intended scene of execution has been named the Rye-house plot, involved in the same common accusation and destruction both those who were really concerned, and those others also, who had been driven to consider generally, whether a forcible resistance ought not to be opposed to the tyranny of the government, but had never harboured the thought of assassination, and had even declined, as bloody and unwarrantable, the expedient of surprising the guards of the king. Among the latter fell the virtuous lord Russell, whose general estimation was such, that his name would in the opinion of the public have justified an open resistance, and whose apparent connexion with a band of assassins disparaged and disgraced for that very reason the party in opposition, beyond what could have been effected by the plainest conviction of any other individual. Even the consultation however about a plan of resistance, though abundantly provoked by the abuses of a government, which had become subservient to a foreign state for the purpose of executing a plan of domestic despotism, was yet destitute of the indispensable justification, which can alone be afforded by the general concurrence of the people. The necessity of resistance had not yet been generally felt by the community: an insurrection therefore must then have been an unavailing struggle against the existing authorities; and the project served only to hasten, by the ruin of the opposition, the arrival of a crisis, which spread through the whole nation one common conviction of the duty of effecting a revolution.

From the dissolution of the last parliament of this reign, which occurred nearly four years before the death of Charles[40], the influence of the party in opposition had begun to decline. The more sober part of the nation began from that time to repent of the cruelties, into which it had been hurried by the clamour of the popish plot; the unexpected firmness of the king, in resisting the strenuous exertions

to a meeting for the purpose of hindering violent resolutions, and that at this meeting there were things said by some, with much more heat than judgment, which he did sufficiently disapprove.—Ibid., p. 118.

[40] Somerville, p. 156.

employed for excluding his brother from the succession, disconcerted the timorous; and the apparent fairness, with which he professed a disposition to yield every other concession for the security of the established religion, conciliated the moderate party. It was accordingly then that Charles began to execute that audacious system of measures, by which the liberties of the people were destroyed, and the very principles of constitutional independence were proscribed.

As the independent interest was powerful in the city of London[41], and a great proportion of criminal causes was brought to trial within its precincts, the first effort of the court was employed to acquire the nomination of its sheriffs, for the purpose of forming juries disposed to concur with the wishes of the crown. The effort was successful, and was followed by the most vindictive exercise of the power thus obtained, particularly in enforcing with rigour the laws enacted against the protestant dissenters. For enabling the king however to support a system of arbitrary power[42], an expedient was necessary, which should corrupt the constitution of parliaments, and render them wholly subservient, the bounty of France being not only precarious, but also inadequate to the expenses of the court[43], and the people of England being too much attached to parliaments, to endure their total suppression. For this purpose the charters of corporations, in the first instance that of the metropolis, were assailed by writs of *quo warranto;* and some were wrested from them by judicial decisions, some were extorted by compulsory resignations.

It was at this critical period that the leaders of the late opposition were ruined by the detection of the plot for assassinating the king, with which they had no real connexion.

[41] Somerville, p. 163. [42] Ibid., p. 166. [43] 'We are however much indebted to the memory of Barbara duchess of Cleveland, Louisa duchess of Portsmouth, and Mrs. Eleanor Gwyn. We owe a tribute of gratitude to the Mays, the Killigrews, the Chiffinches, and the Grammonts. They played a serviceable part in ridding the kingdom of its besotted loyalty. They saved our forefathers from the star-chamber, and the high-commission-court; they laboured in their vocation against standing armies and corruption; they pressed forward the great ultimate security of English freedom, the expulsion of the house of Stuart.'—Hallam's Constit. Hist. vol. ii. p. 479. The expenses occasioned by these persons had also a beneficial influence, as they created the necessities of the king.

This event discomfited all the efforts of the party. The spirit of the nation, now deprived of leaders, was broken and subdued, and the party of the court became triumphant over the prostrate liberties of the people. Nor was the triumph of the court confined to the merely practical superiority, which it had obtained over all its adversaries, but was blazoned in the formal promulgation of the doctrine of passive obedience[44]. On the very day of the execution of lord Russell, the university of Oxford published its famous decree[45], which, comprising in twenty-seven propositions every principle urged in any case to justify resistance, condemned all as false, seditious, and impious, and most of them as heretical and blasphemous, infamous to the Christian religion, and destructive of all government in church and state.

Hume has attributed to this monarch the merit of proposing to reform his government, just when he had accomplished his favourite scheme of unlimited power[46]. The rumour of such an intention, he says, is confirmed by king James's memoirs. But in the original narrative of the life of that king, recently published, the situation of Charles is described as at that time affording him unmixed satisfaction[47], his enemies having been reduced to the most entire submission, and his brother cordially and indefatigably assisting him in the public business. Welwood has mentioned a transient expression of impatience, uttered by Charles a few days before the commencement of his last illness[48], which was accompanied by a declaration that, if he should live but a month longer, he would find a way to make himself easy for the rest of his life. Though we should suppose

[44] In the beginning of this reign the royalists had inserted in three several acts of parliament an oath of non-resistance, by which they proposed to guard against the principles of non-conformists. As however the character of the king became more developed, the royalists felt themselves less secure of his adherence to the religion and constitution of the state, and became less disposed to magnify his authority. Accordingly in the year 1675, when it was proposed to render the oath almost universal, the measure was carried in the house of lords by a majority of only two voices; its further progress was arrested by a dispute which occurred between the two houses. [45] Rapin, vol. ii. pp. 730, 731. This was in the year 1683. [46] Hist. of England, vol. viii. p. 220. [47] Life of James II., vol. i. p. 746.
[48] Memoirs, p. 95.

that this declaration implied an intention of an entire change of measures, we may notwithstanding deem it advantageous and seasonable that the king was then withdrawn, and that his brother, a prince as arbitrary, and more bigoted, succeeded without any interval of reformation. The voluntary change of the counsels of Charles, which perhaps would have consisted in withdrawing his favour from the Roman Catholics[49], and restoring it to the established church, could but have tended to obstruct the mutual adjustment of the several parties of the state. If James had afterwards succeeded, it could have produced no permanent effect; if he had been set aside for the duke of Monmouth, there might have been no revolution, with its beneficial influences.

The history of Scotland from the restoration to the union is scarcely at all connected with the affairs of England[50]. It was indeed soon perceived, that the force of the former country might be rendered instrumental in establishing arbitrary power in the latter, and with this design an act was procured from its enslaved parliament, for embodying a militia of twenty-two thousand men[51], and empowering the privy council to send them whithersoever the honour or safety of the king might require. It was natural that, as they had been baffled by the Independents in their original plan of establishing their covenant in the neighbouring country, they should become the zealous supporters of that royalty, by which their more successful rivals had been in their turn depressed. The Scotish parliament accordingly[52], which was convened soon after the restoration, proceeded at once to establish in their utmost extent the prerogatives of the crown; and, as the acts of two former parliaments were inconsistent with the design of altering the ecclesiastical part of the constitution, and the particular repeal of their acts might cause an inconvenient alarm, a *rescissory* law was enacted for repealing the parliaments themselves, as injurious to the prerogative, or irregular in form. But, fortunately for the development of the English

[49] Welwood has mentioned a rumour of an intention of recalling his illegitimate son, the duke of Monmouth, and sending away the duke of York, which began to prevail at that time, and some circumstances, which gave it probability.—p. 95. [50] Laing, vol. ii. p. 1.

[51] Ibid., pp. 55, 64. [52] Ibid., pp. 7, 8.

government, the affections of the Scots were wholly alienated by the extraordinary tyranny of their government, so that no disposition could exist among them, to support in the neighbouring country the pretensions of the common sovereign.

Charles, though adverse to the presbyterian system of religion, was too little interested in matters of this kind, to be inclined to interfere with the existing arrangements of the church of Scotland. To the influence of Clarendon[53] accordingly has been chiefly attributed the determination to suppress that ecclesiastical establishment, which the king had solemnly accepted at the death of his father. Instead of merely claiming a presidency in the presbyteries[54], which continued to be assembled, the prelates, whom James had thus moderately introduced, assumed under Charles II. an exclusive authority, the presbyters being reduced to act only as their officials. Three hundred and fifty ministers[55] were, for opposing this alteration of the ecclesiastical system, ejected from their benefices; the people, dissatisfied with their successors, began to hold conventicles in the fields, that they might attend the worship of their former pastors[56];

[53] Laing, vol. ii. pp. 4, 18, 19. [54] Ibid., pp. 21, 22.

[55] Ibid., pp. 27, 44. [56] Of the persecutions in Scotland the most dreadful accounts have been transmitted. In the year 1664 an ambulatory court was constituted on the plan of the Inquisition, and the western counties, which continued refractory, were subjected to the violence of the soldiery at intervals during three years.—Ibid., pp. 34, 35. In the year 1676 *letters of intercommuning* were issued, by which the absent were cut off from all the intercourses of society. Seventeen thousand persons of either sex, and of every rank and description, were harassed in the west for attendance on conventicles, or for absence from church; and numbers of persons outlawed themselves, or, terrified at the proscription of others, abandoned their residences, and contracted the savage habits of an unsettled and vagrant life.—Ibid., pp. 68, 69. In the year 1685 a sanguinary period began, from which 'historians have averted their eyes with horror:' nor has any certain computation been preserved of the number of the sufferers. The massacres too, which were begun in this reign, became more violent in that which succeeded; and an expression ascribed to James was repeated with horror, that it never would be well with Scotland, until the country south of the Forth were reduced to a hunting-field. —Laing, vol. ii. pp. 136—138. Hume has stated, that in the year 1682 more than two thousand persons were outlawed, on pretence of having had intercourse with rebels.—Hist., vol. viii. p. 183.

and the military execution, to which they were subjected for their disobedience, drove them into an insurrection, which was a mere effort of despair, and but aggravated their sufferings. The supremacy of the crown[57] was more formally established than in England, for an act of the parliament was procured, declaring the regulation of the church to be an inherent prerogative of the king. As the Presbyterians were excluded from all influence by declarations and oaths, the most valuable privileges of the nation were at the same time relinquished[58]; and the judicial power was likewise so dreadfully perverted, that a defence[59] was rejected simply because it impeached the evidence produced on the part of the government.

Government thus oppressive, while it neutralised that renewed attachment to royalty, by which the Scots might have been incited to interfere once more in the political combinations of England, had a further and important influence in detaching that people from the family of the Stuarts, and preparing them to concur in the revolution, by which the Scotch dynasty was soon afterwards removed from the throne. As if to complete the alienation of the Scots, by directing their indignation personally against the last prince of that dynasty, he was during the latter years of the reign of his brother invested with the government of that country, in which, by the persecution and ruin of the earl of Argyle[60], he rendered the Presbyterians, whose leader that nobleman was, for ever irreconcilable.

As the relation, in which Ireland stood to England, was different, so did it experience a different management. That country had not yet exercised its chief influence on the

[57] Laing, vol. ii. p. 54. [58] The triennial succession and freedom of parliaments, the choice of the lords of articles, and the independence of the judges.—Ibid., p. 45. [59] Ibid., p. 126. [60] Ibid., p. 118. 'It is in vain that apologetical historians pretend, in vain does James assert in his memoirs, that nothing more was intended, than to wrest some dangerous jurisdictions out of the hands of Argyle—Argyle had already offered to surrender these jurisdictions unconditionally to the king. The design was to ruin the head of the presbyterian party, and to divide his estate among the duke's friends—Charles, who possessed not the common justice to pardon and restore him, had the generosity not to enquire after the place of his retreat.'—Ibid., pp. 116, 117. Argyle had escaped to London from his confinement.

English parties. It was accordingly necessary, in the first instance, to secure the connexion of Ireland with the protestant government of England by giving to the Irish Protestants a decisive ascendency, and then to dispose the Roman Catholics of that country, still a numerous and formidable party, to look to the sovereigns of the reigning family as their friends and protectors. In the reign of Charles II., as it related to Ireland, we may distinguish two periods, in which these processes were respectively executed. Ten years of this reign were employed in establishing, by the acts of settlement and explanation, the ascendency of the Protestants; and seven were then occupied in encouraging the hopes of the Roman Catholics, whom these acts had depressed and exasperated. The remainder was filled by a second government of the duke of Ormond, whose wisdom and moderation appear to have been necessary for maintaining good order in Ireland, when England was agitated by the terror of the popish plot.

The first care of the king, in regard to the government of Ireland, was to make such a distribution of lands, as might satisfy the claims of the several parties, by which he was importuned. It had indeed been ordained by the English parliament in the interregnum[61], that the native Irish should be confined to the province of Connaught, so that the new settlers should not be exposed to that degeneracy, which had been experienced from an intercourse with them. This ordinance however had been very imperfectly executed, and it remained for the king to determine, what portions of the other provinces they should be permitted to occupy, rewarding at the same time those loyalists among them, whom the parliament had felt no disposition to favour. With this view, erroneously conceiving that a sufficient quantity of land could be found for gratifying the various claimants, he hastily published a declaration for the settlement of Ireland. A parliament was assembled in the following year for giving to this declaration the authority of law, and an act of settlement was accordingly passed in the year 1662, modifying however in various particulars the original scheme, and subjecting the native Irish to such a reduction of territory, as

[61] Leland, vol. iii. pp. 396—399.

might supply the deficiency to the rest. Three years afterwards the measure was completed by an act of explanation, which was soon found to be necessary for amending and perfecting that of settlement. In this manner was effected a revolution of property, by which the ascendency of the Protestants was placed on the solid basis of territorial possession, the estates of the English[62], which before the war were but equal to half of those of the Irish[63], being at the conclusion of this arrangement more than double those of the other party.

To this severe measure the king was driven by the necessity of compensating services, which he could not but acknowledge. He had however no disposition to depress the Roman Catholics, and even resisted the efforts of the Irish commons to exclude them from their house[64]. But for adopting a system of administration favourable to that party, it was necessary that the duke of Ormond should be removed from the government. This nobleman had fulfilled his honourable duty by carrying into execution the embarrassing arrangements of the acts of settlement and explanation, by recovering the protestant church of Ireland from the presbyterian[65] ministry, established in it by the commonwealth

[62] Tracts by Sir W. Petty, p. 317. [63] Sir W. Petty computed that Ireland contained of Irish measure 7,500,000 acres of good land; and that of this quantity the Protestants in the year 1672 possessed 5,140,000 acres, the Irish 2,280,000, and that nearly 80,000 remained in the common stock.—Ibid., p. 302. [64] A bill, which had been transmitted for imposing on their members an oath of qualification, calculated for this purpose, was suppressed in England as unseasonable. A subsequent resolution of the commons, that no members should sit in their house, who had not taken the oaths of supremacy and allegiance, though it artfully involved other persons, obnoxious for having sat in the pretended high courts of justice, was condemned by the justices as an invasion of the prerogative, in requiring qualifications different from those, which the king had expressed in his writ.—Leland, vol. iii. p. 421. This parliament, which had been assembled in the year 1662, was prorogued in the following year; it was reassembled in the year 1665, and dissolved in the year 1666, from which time until the year 1692, no parliament was assembled in Ireland, except that irregularly convened by James II. The dissolution was occasioned by a dispute about ceremonies to be observed in conferences of the two houses.—Hist. of the Irish parliament by Lord Mountmorres, vol. ii. pp. 138, 144—148. London, 1792. The interruption appears to have been advantageous, as it withdrew the legislature from the struggle of parties.

[65] Leland, vol. iii. p. 411. As the protestant interest in Ireland de-

when the episcopal clergy had been swept away by the rebellion of the Roman Catholics, by directing and encouraging the industry of the nation[66], when the ignorant jealousy of the English had thrown it upon its own resources by prohibiting the importation of Irish cattle[67], and by restoring and protecting the university, which had necessarily experienced a violent shock amidst the public confusion. He was at length disgraced by the influence of the *cabal* administration, which had previously succeeded in overpowering his friend the earl of Clarendon.

Lord Berkeley, who after the transitory government of lord Robarts succeeded to the lieutenancy of Ireland, began the scheme of forming in that country a popish party[68], to support the plan of arbitrary power, which the king had already conceived. With this view he gave all the countenance of his government to that bigoted portion of the Roman

pended on the support of England, it was important that the legal establishment of religion should be preserved in correspondence with it. A secondary establishment was however formed for the presbyterian church by the grant named the *regium donum*, which was at this time begun. [66] With this view he established a woollen-manufactory at Clonmel, the capital of his county palatine of Tipperary, and another at Carrick, a town also belonging to him; and for this purpose Grant, known by his observations on the bills of mortality, was employed to procure five hundred Walloon protestant families to remove from Canterbury to Ireland. His principal object however was to restore the linen-manufacture, which had been begun by Strafford, but had been ruined by the public disorders. He engaged Sir W. Temple to send to Ireland from Brabant five hundred families, skilled in that manufacture; and others were procured from Rochelle, the isle of Rhe, Jersey, and the neighbouring parts of France. Convenient tenements were erected for them at Chapel-Izod near Dublin.—Leland, vol. iii. pp. 449, 450. [67] It was found that the rents of England had latterly decreased to the annual amount of 200,000*l*. Of this diminution there were many obvious causes. Persecution had banished to Holland and America many industrious Puritans; the trade with Spain had been diminished and interrupted; an unfavourable balance of the trade with France amounted nearly to a million annually; the Dutch war had embarrassed commerce; the plague had lessened the consumption of provisions; and the gaiety and dissipation of the court had seduced the nobility to London. The annual value of the cattle sent to England was on the other hand far less than the deficiency of rents: and before the troubles of England far greater numbers had been imported without causing any diminution of them. The complaint in this case was encouraged by some great men, who wished to drive Ormond from the government of Ireland.—Ibid., pp. 442—448. [68] Ibid., p. 458.

Catholics, which under the direction of the pope[69] was opposed to those, who professed to renounce every tenet inconsistent with their civil allegiance, and especially the power of deposing princes claimed by the see of Rome. He accordingly granted to them commissions of the peace[70], he admitted them to dwell and trade in corporate towns, and he procured for them not only admission into the corporation of the metropolis, but even the command of that body. This indulgence naturally inspired the hope of reversing the recent settlement of the property of the country, and a petition for that purpose was accordingly transmitted to the king[71]. The people of England however clamoured against the conduct of the Irish government, and a remonstrance of the parliament of that country compelled the ministers to withdraw for a time their favour from the Roman Catholics.

When the government of lord Berkeley had received this check an intrigue of the court most unexpectedly restored the duke of Ormond to the lieutenancy, the duke of York finding no other competitor[72], who might be opposed with success to the solicitation of his illegitimate brother the duke of Monmouth, of whom he was jealous. This appointment immediately preceded the alarm of the popish plot, which

[69] On the restoration some of the Roman Catholic prelates and clergy commissioned Peter Walsh, a Franciscan friar, to present an address to the king, congratulating him on the event, and imploring the benefits of the peace concluded with Ormond in the year 1648. Walsh, to obviate the objection, which might be drawn from the conduct of many of his brethren in violating that peace, prepared a representation, which was named the Remonstrance of the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland. It was immediately subscribed by one bishop and twenty-four of the other clergy, then in London: and afterwards by another bishop and forty-two priests, together with twenty-one peers and a hundred commoners of the laity. The influence of the pope was however soon exerted to suppress a declaration of allegiance, which disclaimed all knowledge of his assumed power of deposing princes. The clerical remonstrants were accordingly dispossessed of their cures and stations, and Walsh and his associates were denounced as excommunicated persons. That the right even to the temporal dominion of Ireland was not relinquished by the Roman see, appears from this, that O'Broudin maintained it in a work printed in Rome by permission in the year 1722, and that this work has been highly praised by another Irish bishop, the author of the *Hibernia Dominicana*, in the year 1762.—O'Conor's Hist. Address, part i. p. 251. [70] Leland, vol. iii. pp. 463, 464. [71] Ibid., pp. 465, 466. [72] Ibid., p. 472.

required all the prudence and the moderation of that able statesman. When the alarm had passed away, and the detection of the Rye-house plot had discredited the opposite party, another agent was selected for executing the favourite schemes of the king. The death of the king however, which immediately followed, transferred to his successor the care of accomplishing his designs.

While the domestic policy of Charles II. was disposing the government to a revolution, by developing a scheme of arbitrary power, and by preparing for its support the Roman Catholics of Ireland, his foreign policy was on the other hand unconsciously preparing that distinguished prince, who soon afterwards became the leader of the party, by which the scheme was frustrated. All the measures of this king appear thus to have strangely co-operated to the same catastrophe, his love of power and attachment to the church of Rome offending and alienating his subjects, and his wars and negotiations, however various and even contradictory, all bringing forward the prince, who should vindicate their violated liberties.

The king was in the year 1664 driven into a war with the Dutch republic by the commercial jealousy of his people [73], aided by the military ambition of the duke of York, and perhaps by his own desire of reinstating his nephew, the young prince of Orange, in the authority possessed by his ancestors and of thereby bringing the republic into a dependence on England. This war, in which the acquisition of New York was an important advantage gained by the English [74], was terminated in the year 1667 by the peace of Breda. Though it did not re-establish the young prince, it shook the influence of the party [75], which then governed the republic, and disposed the Dutch to look to him as the most eligible president of their state.

In the following year the foreign policy of the king took a contrary direction, in negotiating the triple alliance with the Dutch republic and Sweden for resisting the ambition of

[73] Hume, vol. vii. pp. 424, 425. [74] Ibid., p. 451. [75] Five provinces expressed an opinion, that to incline the king of England to a speedy peace, it would be proper to elevate his nephew to the station of captain-general. The measure was however then defeated by the influence of Holland.—Kerroux, tome iii. pp. 726, 727.

France, which had just then begun to be displayed in the invasion of the Spanish Netherlands. The Dutch were by this alliance withdrawn from that French connexion, which had supported the party opposed to the family of the prince. This party continued indeed to hold the government, but no longer aided by the influence of the court of France.

This popular and wise policy did not long continue to guide the counsels of the king, for in the year 1670 the *cabal* persuaded him to seek in a close alliance with France the means of establishing arbitrary power at home, and of changing the religion of the state. War was accordingly declared against the Dutch in the year 1672; and the result was that in the same year the prince was placed at the head of the republic, and his adversaries, the De Wits, were massacred by the populace.

Two years afterwards the necessity of his affairs constrained the king to endeavour to conciliate his people by concluding a peace with the republic; and in the year 1675 he was induced by the same consideration to entertain a proposal, for marrying the prince to the elder daughter of his brother, whom, with her sister [76], he had, to satisfy the nation, obliged his brother to educate in the protestant faith. The marriage was completed in the year 1677, which connected the prince with a princess, who would probably inherit the crown, the king having no legitimate children, and the duke no male issue. By this extraordinary combination of successive events was the prince first gradually raised from obscurity to power in his own country, and then closely connected with the crown of England, to which he had already some claim by his maternal descent from the father of the king.

It has been remarked by Hume [77], that Charles might, at the time of this marriage, have with ease preserved the

[76] That sister, afterwards queen Anne, was in the year 1684, married to another Protestant, prince George brother of the king of Denmark, the king being then anxious to confirm by such an alliance the popularity, which he had acquired since the detection of the Rye-house plot. That the two princesses were educated protestants is attributed by Carwithen to the influence of Compton, bishop of London, vol. iii. p. 169. In favour of the marriage of Mary, it was urged to the king, that it would lead the people to regard the religion of the presumptive heir of the crown as personal, not political.—Kerreux, tome iii. p. 171.

[77] Hist. of England, vol. viii. p. 33.

balance of Europe; and it may be admitted that he might have maintained it for the time. But this consideration does not detract from the importance of the revolution of England, in its relation to the general policy of Europe. That event connected the domestic policy of the British government with the maintenance of a general system of equilibrium, and thus engaged these countries in a combination, which insured its permanence. Charles might, for his own time have restrained the ambition of the French king. William, by effecting the revolution of England, established a durable equipoise of political power.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Of the history of Great Britain and Ireland from the accession of James II. in the year 1685 *to the revolution in the year* 1688.

James II. king, in the year 1685—Argyle's invasion of Scotland, and Monmouth's invasion of England, in the same year—The revolution, 1688—Flamstead—Newton—Locke.

THOUGH but a few years before a bill for excluding James II. from the throne on account of his religion, had twice passed the house of commons, his accession on the death of his brother was as tranquil, as if no apprehension of his bigotry had ever been entertained. The spirit of the opposition had yielded implicitly to the ascendency of the crown; and as James had been supposed to possess great influence during the latter years of the preceding reign, it was natural to expect, that his government would be but a continuation of the system of measures, in which the nation had already acquiesced.

Several correspondencies may be observed in the characters of these two princes. They were both eagerly desirous of arbitrary power, both became proselytes to the religion of Rome, and both were contented to seek pecuniary resources

in a dishonourable dependence on the court of France[1]. But a yet more considerable diversity may also be discerned. Charles, dissipated and indolent, was desirous of uncontrolled power, chiefly as the means of undisturbed enjoyment: James, devoted to the religion for which he had forsaken that of his country, appears to have regarded the aggrandisement of his political power[2] chiefly as the means of bringing back the country to the ecclesiastical system of Rome. The former was incapable of adopting a violent and hazardous plan of action, and was, on one occasion, overheard, as he declared himself unfitted for executing some counsel of this nature[3]; the latter soon threw off the slight disguise of fair profession, with which he had thought it necessary to commence his reign[4], and boldly and openly pursued the great object of his policy. This diversity was well accommodated to the difference of the parts, which the two princes sustained in the political drama of the constitution, for the licentious gaiety of Charles, aided as it was by favourable circumstances, could best bring to present submission the yet ill-regulated temper of the nation, and the violent bigotry of James[5] was precisely the quality, which could best expose

[1] James was indeed in this respect little successful, having received only 800,000 livres.—App. to Mr. Fox's Hist., p. 126. Louis XIV. was then reigning in peace, and did not feel any need of an expensive connexion.—Ibid., p. 120. [2] This, in contradiction of the representation of Mr. Fox, has been proved by Mr. Hallam.—Constitutional History, vol. iii. p. 74, note. [3] Brother, said Charles, I am too old to go again to my travels; you may, if you choose it.—Hume, vol. viii. p. 220. [4] In addressing the privy council at his accession, James expressly promised to maintain the church of England as then by law established; this speech, at the desire of the privy council, he caused to be printed, and distributed among the people; and in opening his parliament he renewed his declaration in favour of the established church. To the Scotish parliament he conveyed by letter a similar assurance.—Rapin, vol. ii. pp. 741—745.

[5] 'The prejudice, which the two last Stuarts had acquired in favour of the Roman religion, so often deplored by thoughtless or insidious writers as one of the worst consequences of their father's ill fortune, is to be accounted rather among the most signal links in the chain of causes, through which a gracious providence has favoured the consolidation of our liberties and welfare. Nothing less than a motive more universally operating than the interests of civil freedom, would have stayed the compliant spirit of this unworthy parliament, or rallied, for a time at least, the supporters of indefinite prerogative under a banner they abhorred.'—Hallam, vol. iii. p. 72

the mischiefs of passive obedience, and give being to a regenerated spirit of constitutional resistance.

How important to the approaching crisis was the personal character of James II., may be estimated from the observation of Mr. Fox, that in the difficulty of determining, at the death of Charles II., what might be the future fortune of the government, he who should have expected a favourable result, must have directed his attention to the character of the new prince, not to the circumstances of the public. The rashness of the sovereign, in avowing and pressing forward the offensive cause of popery, he regarded as the redeeming principle of the state, which could be counteracted only by a want of moderation in the opposite party. Under the influence however of this principle with most extraordinary rapidity was that gloom dissipated, which had settled on the prospects of the nation, for four years had not elapsed, when the revolution constituted the brightest epoch of the liberties of England.

The peculiar character of James was not indeed left to operate by its own influence, unaided by the excitement of contingent circumstances. Within a very few months from the commencement of his reign, two simultaneous invasions of Scotland and England, of the former country under the duke of Argyle, of the latter under the duke of Monmouth, gave by their discomfiture that strength and encouragement to the king, which are always the results of unsuccessful rebellion. With the lives of these two noblemen[6] every hope of resisting the absolute power of the king seems to have been terminated; and the king appears to have then felt himself sufficiently secure to take decided measures in favour of the Roman Catholics, though at the hazard of offending the party of the established church, by which he had been hitherto supported against all dissenters. Lord Rochester accordingly, the son of the lord chancellor Clarendon, and high in the esteem of the party of the church, declared that from the defeat of the rebellion he had ceased to be intrusted

[6] Fox's Hist. of James II., p. 276. It is remarkable that the counsels of the malecontents appear to have been precipitated by the interference of James with his son-in-law, the prince of Orange, in procuring their dismissal from his court, if not their banishment from the republic.—Carwithen, vol. iii. p. 251.

with the confidential communications of the king, being consulted only on the business of the office of treasurer, which he held.

As the destruction of the popular leaders in the preceding reign had made room for the free indulgence of the arbitrary disposition of Charles, so did the discomfiture of the two invasions encourage James to display the true spirit of his character, outraging the humanity of his subjects by the violences of his vengeance[7], and alarming their religious principles by his undisguised exertions for subverting the ecclesiastical establishments of the two kingdoms. The agents were however different, as the process of unconstitutional government was more advanced. When the ruin of the domestic leaders of the public discontent had exalted the power of the sovereign above all opposition, the ruin of invaders alone could add to its aggrandisement, and lead the infatuated sovereign onward to his degradation.

The combination of circumstances assisting in effecting the revolution, was not however limited to domestic agencies. Within the very same year the king of France, by revoking the edict of Nantes, which eighty-seven years before had granted protection to the Protestants of that country, spread over Europe an alarming apprehension of the faithless bigotry of his church. The Protestants of Great Britain in particular were warned by the arrival of fifty thousand fugitives[8], to be apprehensive of the measures of their own sovereign, who not only professed himself the faith of Rome, but was beginning to manifest his determination, that the same faith should be the general and authorised profession of his subjects. When they saw too that their king anxiously cultivated a friendly intercourse with the government, which had thus disgraced itself, they might most naturally expect to be themselves objects of similar violences.

While Louis XIV. thus alarmed the Protestants of Great Britain, his overbearing ambition, in grasping at the dominion of the continent of Europe, raised into importance that distinguished prince, who rescued from oppression the liberties

[7] In the famous western assize of Jefferies 330 were executed, and 835 transported, besides many left in custody for want of evidence. Those transported were sold as slaves in the colonies.—Hallam's Constit. Hist., vol. iii. p. 93, note.

[8] Laing, vol. ii. p. 159.

of these countries. So long as Spain was formidable, the protection of France was desirable to the Dutch republic, and a French interest accordingly predominated in the government; but when France at length became the object of apprehension, the party connected with France was deprived of authority, and the prince of Orange, whose family that government had persecuted, found his personal interest identified with the independence of his country.

The other continental states were at the same time sufficiently interested in observing the same plan of policy. Austria and Spain were alarmed at the ambition of France; the protestant states were specially excited to resistance by the complaints of the exiled Huguenots; and even the Roman pontiff, forgetting the merit of persecution in his indignant sense[9] of the independent and refractory spirit of the eldest son of the church, perhaps also apprehensive of the headlong precipitancy of James[10], was favourably disposed to-

[9] 'According to ancient custom the ambassadors of catholic princes, residing at Rome, enjoyed an exemption from the jurisdiction of that court, and immunities connected with that privilege, which were called the *franchises*. By imperceptible degrees these were extended, not only to the servants and household of the ambassador, but to every other person received under his protection, and were at last found to encroach far upon the dignity and domestic authority of the papal court. Bent upon his own personal grandeur, more than upon the extension of his power over distant kingdoms, Innocent XI. most anxiously solicited the catholic princes to resign a privilege, which tended to the disparagement of his honour, and the limitation of his immediate jurisdiction. The house of Austria set that example of obsequiousness, which was followed by the other catholic princes in Europe. The king of France alone, with inflexible obstinacy, contended for the maintenance of all those honours, which, by long prescription, were claimed by his ambassadors. The solicitations of the English ambassador were interposed in behalf of France, and instead of softening Innocent, involved James in a participation of the guilt and odium of his ally.'—Somerville, p. 236. This pontiff had been already alienated from the king of France by the edict sanctioning the declaration of the French clergy, framed in the year 1683, concerning ecclesiastical power, which stated, first, that the pope has no authority over the temporalities of kings; secondly, that a general council is superior to the pope; thirdly, that the exercise of his power ought to be regulated by the canons without infringing the liberties of ths Gallican church; fourthly, that the decisions of the pope in matters of faith are not infallible, until they have been approved by the church.—Henault, vol. ii. p. 194.

[10] 'It was suggested to Innocent, that by a revolution in England he might expect, not only to obtain the gratification of private resentment, but the advancement

wards an expedition, which should dethrone a Roman Catholic in favour of a Protestant. This prince felt that all his combinations would be ineffectual, unless the power of Great Britain were enlisted in the struggle. The revolution accordingly, which adjusted the constitution of England, became an essential part of the great system of operations, which was necessary for arranging the general policy of Europe. The two distinct processes, one of which perfected a free government, and the other combined a system of balanced policy among independent nations, were thus united in that memorable event; and the English government began to maintain a permanent and important connexion with the interests of the continental states, from the time when it had completed its interior agitations, and was fitted to influence by the example of regulated freedom the public mind of European society.

That all his attachment to his own religion should have prompted James to endeavour to render it predominant, must appear most surprising when it is considered, that the Roman Catholics were judged by Sir William Temple to be scarcely the hundredth part of the population of England[11], and not to be even the two-hundredth part of that of Scotland. His immediate dependence was placed on that doctrine of absolute submission[12], which was professed by the

of the catholic interest in that kingdom. A toleration, which was agreeable to the avowed principles of William, would secure their personal safety, and the undisturbed exercise of their religion to all the disinterested and sincere friends of the Roman church, whereas the violence and precipitancy of James might one day rouse the fury of the nation, and terminate in the final extirpation of those, whom he wished to cherish.'—Somerville, p. 238. [11] 'Hume, vol. viii. p. 8. 'There is a return of persons of different persuasions in England, made a few years after, when the whole number of Catholics fit to bear arms in the provinces of Canterbury and York, was only 4940.'—Moore's History of the British Rev., p. 173. [12] This doctrine was maintained by Luther, though he assented to the league of the Protestants as a defensive confederacy, when it had been represented to him that resistance in such a case was permitted by the laws.—Sleidani Comm., p. 195. It first manifested itself among the established clergy of the English Protestants in the convocation, which James consulted in the beginning of his reign about the lawfulness of assisting the Dutch against the Spaniards.—Welwood's Mem., p. 36. In the reign of Charles II. advantage began to be taken of this principle, about the time of the popish plot, to procure support for

established church; nor did it occur to him that this tenet, which had been embraced in opposition to the protestant dissenters, might give way when it should be rendered instrumental to the triumph of the church of Rome. But his grand dependence was placed on the superior number of the Roman Catholics in Ireland[13]. In that part of his triple

the government, and it was eagerly propagated as the tenet of the church.—Ibid., p. 88. The university of Oxford in the year 1683, on occasion of the rye-house plot, asserted the doctrine in the most explicit terms; and at the execution of the duke of Monmouth, in the year 1685, the clergymen who attended him, required an acknowledgment of the unlawfulness of resistance, as an indispensable article of the faith of a member of the church of England.—Mr. Fox's Hist., pp. 263, &c. From this very time however the church ceased to cherish this tenet, as the king began to manifest his hostility to the ecclesiastical establishment. In the very following year the preachers every where began to declaim against popery; and in the crisis of the revolution the bishops declined to disown the declaration of the prince of Orange, which stated that he had been invited 'by divers of lords, both spiritual and temporal,' and refused to concur in a declaration expressing abhorrence of his enterprise.—Rapin, vol. ii. p. 776. The change of opinion, which had thus preceded the revolution, was naturally carried further after that event. Hoadly, who in the year 1710 was recommended to queen Anne by the house of commons, and was afterwards advanced to the bishopric of Bangor, was the most distinguished in that party of the church, which maintained the lawfulness of resisting abuses of power, alleging that the sacred scriptures recognised a reciprocal duty on the part of the government, the violation of which discharged the subjects from the duty of submission.

[13] Sir W. Petty estimated the whole population of Ireland for the year 1672, as about 1,100,000 persons, and the proportion of the Roman Catholics to the Protestants to have been then that of eight to three. The entire number of the Roman Catholics therefore he estimated as about 800,000 persons, and consequently he must have supposed that they had among them more than 100,000 men of a military age. The population of England and Wales at the time of the revolution was estimated by Gregory King at 5,500,000 persons, which however Mr. Chalmers thinks should have been computed at 6,000,000, or nearly 7,000,000, too small a number of inhabitants having been allowed for each house in that computation. It has been concluded by King, that the population of England was then five-fold that of Scotland, and six-fold that of Ireland, and consequently that the combined population of these two countries was less than two-fifths of that of England. The conclusion of King, compared with the estimate of Sir W. Petty for Ireland, would give 6,600,000 for England. From a document found by Sir John Dalrymple in the cabinet of king William it appears probable, that in England the proportion of protestant dissenters to conformists was nearly as one to twenty-three, and that of Roman Catholics to Protestants nearly as one to a hundred and eighty-

empire he knew that he should have the greater portion of the population on his side, and thence he hoped to draw forces, by which he should be enabled to crush any resistance opposed to him in Great Britain. As the bigotry of James, considered in its influence upon the improvement of the constitution, required some support, it was evidently conducive to the general welfare, that this support should have been placed in a separate part of the triple empire, rather than that it should have been scattered through the population of that country, in which the processes of the constitution were to be performed.

Before the invasion of Monmouth the English parliament had been disposed to comply with all the wishes of the king, and had unanimously settled a revenue on him for his life, without noticing the illegality, with which he had previously levied taxes. That event however having encouraged him to manifest his intentions in regard to the religion of Rome[14], a spirit of jealousy and resistance began immediately to display itself in the house of commons[15], though with a guarded moderation that assembly proposed to indemnify by law those Roman Catholics, who had served in the army against Monmouth, and even to reward them with pensions. The lords presently caught from the commons the new spirit of freedom, and determined to reconsider the speech delivered by the king at the commencement of the session, in which they had overlooked an intimation of his intention of dispensing with the tests. James then became so alarmed with the apprehension of a parliamentary opposition to his favourite measure, that he determined to forego an uncompleted grant of seven hundred thousand pounds, and to free himself from the embarrassment by an immediate prorogation, which after four others was followed by a dissolution.

The king, having failed to procure a sanction from the parliament, had recourse to the judges, for which purpose a

seven.—Chalmers's Estimate of the Comparative Strength of Great Britain, pp. 37, 56—58; with the Political Conclusions of G. King, annexed, p. 37. [14] James then declared his purpose of employing Roman Catholic officers in his army in England: in Scotland he required of the parliament, that Roman Catholics should be released from all restraints: in Ireland he caused the protestant militia to be disbanded. [15] Somerville, pp. 183, 184.

concerted action was brought against a Roman Catholic, Sir Edward Hales[16], who had accepted the commission of colonel. Though a dispensing power was acknowledged by the law of England to belong to the crown, and was indeed first excluded by the bill of rights, which followed the revolution, yet the case of the power exercised by James was so peculiar, that it was deemed necessary to displace four of the judges, before this cause should be brought forward for trial. A decision favourable to the pretension of the crown was then obtained; but the public felt that a dispensing power exercised so extensively was in effect a power of repealing, which would destroy the legislative character of the parliament, and that if it could be applied to a statute, which was regarded as the barrier of the established religion under a popish sovereign, all the security of that religion was abandoned to the discretion of the crown.

In Ireland the measures of James were even less reserved, as it was chiefly from that country that he proposed to draw the force, by which he hoped to quell the opposition of his English subjects. Scotland had performed its part in the triple system, by affording its support to that presbyterian party, which in the civil war first overturned, and then re-established the monarchy. The part of Ireland was to be performed at this time, in encouraging by the prospect of its assistance those efforts of bigotry, which could alone withdraw the Protestants of the church of England from the influence of their cherished notion of passive obedience. In Ireland accordingly the military struggle of the revolution was fought, and there the contest was at length concluded by the reduction of Limerick in the year 1691, more than two years after the crown had been transferred to the prince of Orange in each of the kingdoms of Great Britain. We may even discover in the relation of the Irish Roman Catholics to the English government some correspondence to the double agency of the Presbyterians of Scotland, for as the latter first supported the party of the republicans, and were then active in restoring the monarchy, so did the Roman Catholics of Ireland first by their strength encourage the bigotry of James II., and then by their vio-

[16] Hume, vol. viii. pp. 256—262.

lence excite that apprehension for the national religion, which drove him from his throne.

The duke of Ormond had formed in Ireland a protestant militia[17], which might best support the new settlement of that country and its connexion with England. Such a force however did not suit the purpose of James, when the discomfiture of Monmouth had freed him from the restraint, under which he had commenced his reign. Pretending therefore that the contagion of the rebellion was widely diffused, he recalled the arms of the militia. He then proceeded to introduce Roman Catholics into corporations, and invest them with magistracies and judicial offices, in disregard of the law requiring that in these cases the oath of supremacy should be administered. Talbot, a Roman Catholic, created earl of Tyrconnell, was next commissioned to regulate the army independently of the lord lieutenant, which he executed by composing it almost wholly of persons professing his own religion; and was soon afterwards himself intrusted with the government, the popish delegate of a popish sovereign, while fifteen hundred families of Protestants judged it necessary to abandon their country in the train of his predecessor. From this time the most violent measures were employed for transferring to the Roman Catholics the ascendency[18], which had been enjoyed by the Protestants. At length Tyrconnell proposed to assemble a parliament for the express purpose of repealing the act of settlement; but this scheme was successfully resisted in the privy council of England.

While Ireland was thus actively concerned in the operations, which ended in the revolution, the direct agency of Scotland was suspended[19], except so far as the invasion of Argyle forced onward that of Monmouth. When James held the government of that country he had, in hostility to the Presbyterians, procured the enactment of a test, which recognised, together with the ecclesiastical supremacy of the king, his uncontrolled and absolute dominion. An atrocious tyranny, ecclesiastical and civil, had subdued that spirit of

[17] Leland, vol. iii. pp. 492—509. [18] The admission of Roman Catholics into the corporations had proceeded slowly during the government of lord Clarendon.—Ibid., pp. 503, 504. [19] Laing, vol. ii. pp. 108, 146—175.

independence, which formerly had operated so powerfully on the government of England, except only when the hereditary persecution of the duke of Argyle, considered as the chief of the Presbyterians, drove him into his rash and unsuccessful enterprise. It had indeed been a favourite scheme of the royal brothers to convert that country, equally as Ireland, into an instrument of the subjugation of England; and with this view an act had in the preceding reign been procured from its enslaved parliament for embodying a militia of twenty-two thousand men[20], and committing the disposal of it to the privy council. But the example of oppressive government exhibited in that country produced a contrary effect, alarming the apprehensions of the English, and giving additional force to the representations, by which their patriots were endeavouring to excite among them a spirit of resistance.

The tyranny of the government of Scotland, it is remarkable, gave being in that country to a law of entails[21], which in England it had been long customary to elude. The nobles, who had been basely subservient to the crown in creating a multiplicity of retrospective treasons, began at length to fear, that they might become the victims of their own servility, and passed an act for securing the succession of lands, that their families at least might be protected from ruin. This act is still in full operation, and it is estimated that more than a fifth, or even a third part of the territory, is covered by such provisions. Entails, which in England had been a result of the independence of a feudal nobility, and had lost their operation in the change of the character of the aristocracy, were thus in Scotland the late effect of modern oppression.

The king, in the second year of his reign, found himself involved in a struggle with the established church of England, to which he had been mainly indebted for his succession to the crown. When he had discovered that the measures, which he had taken in favour of the church of Rome[22], especially in Ireland, had excited its jealousy and opposition, he issued an order inhibiting inflammatory sermons. When again the bishop of London had refused to enforce this

[20] Laing, vol. ii. p. 55. [21] Ibid., pp. 149, 150. [22] Hume, vol. viii. pp. 266—268.

order by summarily suspending an obnoxious preacher, he established an ecclesiastical commission with unlimited authority over the church, though such a commission had in the reign of Charles I. been abolished by law, with an express prohibition of creating any similar jurisdiction in all future time. By this commission both the bishop and the preacher were suspended, and the king proceeded in his course. Not content with granting dispensations to individuals[23], he issued a declaration of general indulgence, suspending at once every penal statute in ecclesiastical affairs, though in the preceding reign the remonstrances of the parliament had twice caused such a proceeding to be retracted. On this occasion James sought the support of the protestant dissenters; but their eyes had been opened to the ultimate mischief of the measure by the unreserved conduct of the king in the government of Scotland[24], where the implicit submission of the parliament had appeared to render caution less necessary.

The whole power in Ireland having been committed to the Roman Catholics[25], the chief ministers in Scotland having been converted to popery, and in England every great office, civil and military, having been gradually transferred from the Protestants, it remained only that the Roman Catholics should be introduced into the establishments connected with the church of England, to complete the triumph of their religion. In this concluding effort however James experienced a resistance, which he was unable to overcome. His first attempt of this kind was to require[26], that a pensioner should be received on the fund of the hospital of the Charter-house, without any declaration of conformity to the church of England, or oath of allegiance. Though this step had been taken at a cautious distance, he was effectually opposed by the trustees. He then demanded that the uni-

[23] Hume, vol. viii. pp. 269—271. [24] The king first demanded of the Scotish parliament an indulgence for the Roman Catholics alone. When this demand was resisted, he published a proclamation of indulgence, which included the Presbyterians; but even in this measure he betrayed the secret purpose of his mind, for, as if popery were already predominant, he declared that he never would use force, or *invincible necessity*, against any man on account of his persuasion, or the protestant religion.—Ibid., p. 272. [25] Ibid., p. 277. [26] Somerville, pp. 191—194.

versity of Cambridge should admit to the degree of master of arts a Benedictine monk without administering any oath whatever; and he again failed. Massey, a recent convert, he collated to the deanery of Christ-Church in Oxford, with an ample dispensation from all the statutes of uniformity and other ecclesiastical laws[27], and he finally enjoined Magdalen-College in the same university to receive a Jesuit priest as president; but the obedience of the university here found that limit, which had been so expressly disclaimed, and the royal mandate was disregarded.

The king, having been also disappointed in his efforts to obtain a parliament[28], which would sanction his measures, determined finally to rely boldly upon his military power, and with this view brought out of Ireland some entire regiments, and filled many vacancies in his English regiments with Roman Catholic officers from the same country. In executing this determination he issued a second declaration of a general indulgence, which perhaps he might have been able to maintain, if he had not resolved, as if under the influence of an infatuation, to render the established church the instrument of its own downfall, by requiring the bishops to cause it to be published in the churches. This mandate, so fitted to expose the clergy to hatred and contempt, exceeded their notion of obedience. It was resisted, and the power of James was at an end. The archbishop of Canterbury and six of the bishops petitioned to be excused[29]; the king brought them to trial for uttering a seditious libel

[27] Hallam's Constit. Hist. vol. iii. p. 89. Instances of similar dispensations are mentioned in a note in the same page. [28] Rapin, vol. ii. p. 768. [29] Eighteen other bishops either sent their direct approbation of their petition, or testified it by declining to distribute the declaration among their clergy. Of the eight remaining dioceses, York and Oxford were vacant. Six bishops complied, Carwithen, vol. iii. p. 324. But, though the archbishop and the six bishops conceived it to be their duty to refuse compliance, and afterwards concurred in inviting the prince of Orange into England, one bishop alone of this number transferred his allegiance. The archbishop and four of the bishops accordingly began the schism of the Nonjurors, and were after some time deprived of their sees. These appear to have been joined by three other bishops and about four hundred of the clergy.—Hallam, vol. iii. p. 148. One of the petitioning bishops died in the very crisis of the revolution.

in presenting their petition[30]; and their acquittal, which was hailed by the acclamations even of his own army, was the signal of the revolution.

A few days before the acquittal of the bishops an event had occurred, which disposed the minds of the Protestants to adopt some decisive measure for their security. So long as the king had no male issue, they consoled themselves with the hope, that their interest might be retrieved under his daughter, who had been educated a Protestant, and was married to a prince of the same religion. By the birth of a son this hope was taken from them, and they began to feel, that the security of their religion required some interposition, by which the regular course of the royal succession should be interrupted. The Roman Catholics at the same time, as they conceived a more sanguine hope of the permanence of their present prosperity, were encouraged to act with greater violence, and thus to alarm yet more the apprehensions of the Protestants. Some mysterious circumstances also accompanying the birth of the prince, involved the king in the odious imputation of imposing upon his people a supposititious child, and seeking thus the gratification of his bigotry even in the violation of natural affection. These were the immediate effects of the appearance of a male heir. Its remoter operation consisted in furnishing a future pretender to the crown, by which the alarm of the Protestants was maintained long after the revolution.

As the precipitate violence of James brought the government to the crisis of revolution, so had the fittest imaginable agent been prepared for effectuating the change. In his infancy divested of his dignities in consequence of the hostile requisitions of Cromwell[31], who persecuted him for his connexion with the Stuarts, and afterwards sacrificed to the advantage of a connexion with France by the very princes, whom his father had assisted in restoring to the throne of the triple kingdom, the prince of Orange was detached equally from the two extreme parties, which contended for the government. He was by birth and profession a Pres-

[30] The archbishop however, to guard himself against this imputation, had used the precaution of writing the petition with his own hand.—Hist. de la Revolution de 1688 en Angleterre par Mazure, tome iii. p. 447. Paris, 1825. [31] Hume, vol. vii. p. 252.

byterian, but his habits had been formed in a tolerating government, and a liberal toleration was the avowed principle of his conduct[32]. As the arbitrary and bigoted schemes of the two latter princes of the house of Stuart had rested on a dishonourable connexion with the government of France, so was the whole policy of William, by the very necessity of his peculiar situation, inseparably united with the cause of the protestant religion, and the maintenance of the liberties of Europe. Even the possession of the throne of these countries appeared to him important, only as it might render him more able to secure these two grand objects of his existence. Cold and uninteresting, he attracted no party by popularity of manners; but these countries had been long in a state of violent excitement, and the phlegmatic virtues of William may have administered the best sedative to the public agitations. Even his frequent want of success in military operations may be considered as belonging to his character, as the negotiator, rather than the warrior of Europe, for success, if it did not tempt him to assume the latter character, would at least have rendered him less dependent on the combinations of policy.

In reviewing the causes, which co-operated to effect the British revolution, the mind must be astonished at their number, their diversity, and their extent. The ambition of Louis XIV. had disposed not only the Dutch to seek in the revolution of the British government new means of resistance, but also the other states of the continent to unite with the republic in a confederacy, which occupied the attention of France, and concealed the preparations of the prince of Orange. While a political interest influenced generally the confederated states, an additional and more powerful motive was furnished to the Protestants by the revocation of the edict of Nantes, which sent every where among them the victims of the bigotry and violence of the French monarch; the very money necessary for defraying the expenses of the expedition[33], was supplied without delay from the private funds of those refugees of religion, who

[32] This however did not extend to the admission of Roman Catholics into situations of trust and power, though he would have consented to the repeal of the penal statutes.—Somerville, pp. 231, 232.

[33] The prince had obtained a credit of four millions of gilders, to be paid in four years, and the zeal of the refugees furnished the money in as many days.—Moore's Hist. of the British Revol., p. 143.

had sought protection in the provinces of the Dutch. The Roman pontiff on the other hand, dissatisfied with the independence of the Gallican church, and offended by the haughtiness of the French monarch, was induced to countenance the overthrow of the most zealous champion of his faith, as he was protected by that prince. The individual, who led the revolution, was recommended to the people of Great Britain by his double connexion with the royal family, both of descent and marriage; and the republic, over which he presided, was sufficiently powerful to guard the change of the British government against the evils of public disorder, yet not enough to menace the country with conquest. The birth of an English prince, occurring in the very crisis, inspired the Roman Catholics with more violence, and filled the Protestants with new apprehensions, while the circumstances of the event subjected the king to the dishonourable imputation of attempting to deceive his people. The storm, which dispersed the invading fleet, and turned back the prince of Orange, afforded to James an opportunity of manifesting to his subjects[34], how little reliance could be placed on the promises, which he had made in the hour of apprehension. So deeply again was the prince himself impressed with a sense of the extraordinary combination of circumstances, which favoured his voyage, that on his landing he demanded of Burnet[35], whether he did not then believe in predestination. It was on the other hand a result of the indecision of James[36], that the king of France had not crushed the enterprise by an invasion of the territory of the Dutch republic; and his precipitate[37] desertion of the

[34] 'The bishop of Winchester, pursuant to the king's order, having caused a citation to be fixed on the gates of Magdalen-College, to recall Doctor Hough and the ejected fellows of that society, was recalled for some frivolous pretence, and the restoration of the college was deferred. But afterwards, the news proving false, the king resumed his pretended affection for the university, and the college was restored.—Rapin, vol. ii. p. 773. [35] Burnet's Hist. of His Own Time, vol. ii. p. 434. [36] Hallam's Constit. Hist. vol. iii. pp. 108—111.—Louis had discovered that James had even privately offered, about the end of September, to join the alliance against him.—Mazure, tome iii. p. 104. [37] It ought never to be forgotten, says Mr. Trever. that, besides having thrown himself on the protection of France, James, had not left the next heir to the crown in the hands of the nation, the queen having previously conveyed him to that country.—Life and Times of William III. vol. i. p. 342.

throne, while it confounded his friends, and encouraged his enemies, not only put a bloodless conclusion to the agitations of the country, but also extricated the revolution from the embarrassment of a metaphysical discussion.

The existence of an original contract between the sovereign and the people was indeed asserted by the commons, and was, though reluctantly, admitted by the lords; and surely, though Paine presumed to assert, that we have no constitution, because we have no detailed specification of principles of government, systematically arranged in a formal distribution of powers, yet never has a nation existed, which could boast so repeated, and so ancient recognitions of its liberties. But, though the doctrine of an original contract was opposed to the pretension of a divine and indefeasible authority, and had even been long before maintained by Hooker[38], in opposition to the pretension of the divine right of the presbytery in the church, yet so cautiously did the English commons avoid the metaphysical subtleties, which have since become popular, that they contented themselves with asserting simply the truth of the principle, while they inferred the vacancy of the throne, with a designed ambiguity, from the violation of fundamental laws, and from the voluntary departure of the king, as well as from his infraction of this original contract. Even in proceeding on all these grounds[39] it was the opinion of the celebrated Somers, afterwards lord Somers, that the world could be satisfied only by showing, that they were justified by a precedent, which had occurred almost a century before in the government of Sweden, when Sigismond and his family were renounced in circumstances differing from those of James only in being less aggravated[40].

[38] That a formal contract existed in the Scotish government between the king and the people, had been maintained by Buchanan in his treatise De Jure Regni apud Scotos. The same was afterwards maintained in regard to the English government by lord Somers, in his tract entitled the Judgment of whole Kingdoms and Nations concerning the Rights, Power, and Prerogative of Kings, and the Rights, Privileges, and Properties of the People. [39] Gray's Debates, vol. ix. p. 16. Lond., 1769. Sigismond, king of Poland, having succeeded to the kingdom of Sweden, endeavoured to change the religion of the latter country for that of Rome, to which he had conformed in Poland; but experiencing a resistance among the Swedes, he withdrew to his other kingdom. [40] He had not withdrawn into the

The Scots[41], who could not allege that James had withdrawn himself from a kingdom, in which he had not resided, and who had been outraged by the severe oppression exercised ever since the restoration, indulged the original independence of their principles in the adoption of the more explicit declaration, that James by his misconduct had forfeited the crown. As the force of Ireland had been enlisted on the part of the king, its unhappy destiny was to become the scene of the hostile struggle of the rejected sovereign and his people, and, in the subsequent depression of the majority of its own population, to suffer the heavy penalty of its adherence to a cause disowned by the constitution.

The separate movements of the British government were at this time sufficiently completed, for enabling it to sustain an important part in the general combinations of Europe and of the world. In these it was at once engaged by the advancement of the prince of Orange to the throne, for this prince was the prime agent of all the negotiations, by which the independence of the other states of Europe was maintained against the ambition of France. Wonderful indeed was the adaptation of independent operations, by which the general arrangement of the policy of the continent and the special modifications of the British government were brought severally to a crisis, at the same precise time, and in the person of the same prince, so that it was a natural and direct result, that the two systems of movements should be then connected, and the British government, in its improved form, be immediately constituted a principal agent in a new and improved order of political relations. In a period of eighty-five years, beginning with the accession of the first prince of the family of the Stuarts to the throne of England, the continental states maintained the great struggle of the German war, and arranged the combinations of the peace of Westphalia, by which it was concluded; and in the same period the British government experienced the two alternate movements, by the one of which it was carried to the extreme of republicanism, by the other to the contrary extreme of despotism. While these two processes were separately performed, pre-

territory of a foreign prince: nor does it appear that he had violated the political constitution of the government. [41] Laing, vol. ii. pp. 189—191.

paration was also made for their combination by the formation and growth of the Dutch republic, and by the connexions, which procured for its stadtholder an interest in the succession of the British crown. An ancient infidel is said to have been converted from atheism to a persuasion of the existence and providence of God, by contemplating the wonderful contrivance of the human skeleton. Here is the skeleton of a most interesting period of the history of our species. The living men, who were its muscles and its tendons, have long perished; nothing remains except the dry and naked skeleton preserved in the records of a by-gone age; but in this are manifested an arrangement and an adaptation, which bespeak a wisdom and foresight far exceeding the speculations of the human intellect.

Two important distinctions appear to characterise the period of the federal policy of Europe, which was at this time commenced. One of these is obviously that it gave to the system a central body, which might best maintain its movements, the external and internal resources of France best qualifying and entitling it to act as the principal member; the other, that it constituted a maritime and commercial state the restraining power, which should control the ambition of the principal state of the continent. When the system had been adjusted to a natural centre, those shocks were precluded, which must have resulted from the natural greatness of France and the contingent aggrandisement of some other continental state[42]; and when on the other hand the British government had become the secondary or restraining power, the struggles of the system were moderated by the pacific spirit of a commercial people, interested in maintaining tranquillity, and shut out from the allurements of military enterprise. The balance thus constituted resembled the distribution of the surface of the globe, on which we live. The sea was balanced against the land; and, while the due equipoise of the whole was preserved about a natural centre, the energies of commerce were allowed their full expansion, to animate the industry, and to exercise the capacities of man.

It has been said of the great philosopher of antiquity, that he threw himself into the Euripus, because he could not dis-

[42] Mably, tome v. p. 68.

cover the principle of its complicated tides. The tradition seems aptly to describe the mere politician of this world. Ignorant of the guiding causes of political changes, he suspects not that he should look to heaven for the controlling influences; and, distracted by their inexplicable appearances, he plunges blindly into their current, and is borne away in its course.

The distinguished philosopher of modern ages, who discovered the cause of the appearances, which have been said to have thus perplexed the great sage of antiquity, was the glory of that period of the English history, which has been considered in this and the preceding chapter. The penetrating genius of Newton presented at this time the most complete and important examples of the plan of philosophical enquiry, which in the earlier part of the sixteenth century had been pointed out by Bacon. Among the minuter phenomena of nature he examined with surprising ingenuity the properties of light [43], applying his grand discovery of the difference of refrangibility to the improvement of the telescope; and in the greater operations of the material universe he first perceived the connexion of the planetary movements with the principle of terrestrial gravitation [44], and was thus enabled to construct a system of physical astronomy, which

[43] His discoveries concerning light were communicated to the Royal Society in the year 1671, though his treatise of Optics was not published until the year 1704. His reflecting telescope, which he had constructed to avoid the confusion arising from the different refrangibility of the component parts of solar light, was afterwards superseded by the *achromatic* or colourless telescope of Dollond. As however it was found impracticable to form compound lenses, such as he proposed, sufficiently large, the principle of reflection was again adopted by Herschel for telescopes of great power. It seems probable that even for this purpose the invention of Dollond may hereafter be preferred, the distinguished son of Herschel having recently discovered, that the difficulty consisted, not in the numerous imperfections incidental to flint-glass, as had been supposed, but in the want of a *parabolic* figure of the lenses, to which they have since been ground. [44] By proving the identity of the force attracting the moon with that of weight at the surface of the earth, he could measure the former, and thence the other planetary forces. It may be here remarked that this discovery could not have been made if the earth were not accompanied by a moon, moving in an elliptic orbit having the earth in one focus; and that the calculations, by which the theory of the solar system has been perfected, have sprung from the numerous and complicated perturbations of that satellite.

later mathematicians have perfected and verified. The very processes, by which he attained his purposes, were not less novel than his discoveries. In forming his theory of light he devised experiments unlike any, which had been previously instituted. In constructing his mathematical system of the universe he perfected the geometrical reasoning of the ancients[45], and, when the powers of geometry and of the ordinary algebra proved insufficient for his sublime enquiry, he invented another mode of reasoning[46], by which he prosecuted his investigations. If the mathematicians of the continent have since provided a method of reasoning more convenient in its use, and more extended in its application, we have reason to believe, that its principle was originally suggested to Leibnitz by a communication from Newton[47], in which he had obscurely intimated his own discoveries. If they have prosecuted their method with an acknowledged

[45] In his method of prime and ultimate ratios, explained in the lemmas, which he has prefixed to his mathematical principles of natural philosophy, first published in the year 1687. The principle of this mode of reasoning may indeed be traced to the earliest period of geometry, and examples of it in its less perfect form may be found in the writings of Archimedes. [46] The method of fluxions. Of this method, or the differential calculus, to which it gave occasion, Sir F. W. Herschel has remarked, that "it has supplied a means of discovery, bearing the same proportion to the methods previously in use, that the steam-engine does to the mechanical powers employed before its invention."—"Whichever way," he adds, "we turn our view, we find ourselves compelled to bow before his genius, and to assign to the name of Newton a place in our veneration, which belongs to no other in the annals of science."—Preliminary Discourses on the Study of Nat. Philos. in Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopædia. Lond. 1831. How abruptly this great genius arose out of the darkness of ignorance and error, and how much the latter has contributed to the advancement of knowledge, may appear from this, that his attention, we are told, was first turned to the study of mathematics by a desire to enquire into the truth of judicial astrology.—Brewster's Life of Newton, p. 13. Lond., 1831. [47] It was the judgment of Montucla, in regard to the very contested claim of priority of invention, that the results of the fluxional reasoning, communicated by Newton without any explanation of his process, led Leibnitz to discover the differential and integral calculus, being however assisted by the previous discoveries of Fermat, Barrow, and Wallis.—Hist. des Mathem. tome iii. p. 109. It seems thus that the littleness in the mind of Newton, which withheld the knowledge of his new mode of reasoning, eventually proved the occasion of a great improvement of mathematical science, by sending the mathematicians of the continent into a different track.

superiority, we here discover the influence of the mind of Newton. Foreign mathematicians have been roused to an honourable emulation, while those of the British empire, reverencing the fame of their great philosopher, have too long lingered in his path.

In noticing the progress of philosophical discovery it may be interesting to remark of the boast of Archimedes, that he could move even the globe of the earth by his mechanic skill, if he could find a place, in which to stand; that we now know from the system of Newton the condition to be perfectly needless, and the boast wholly nugatory, since without any such position, and without any mechanical contrivance, every the slightest motion generated by whatever cause on the surface of our earth, must by the universal agency of gravitation move, not only the earth itself, but the whole planetary, and perhaps also the whole sidereal system.

It is a curious correspondence in the appearance of distinguished men, that as Tycho, the author of practical astronomy, had furnished Kepler with the means of discovering, though still unable to explain, the laws of the planetary motions, so[48] Flamsteed, an English astronomer, provided with the aid of the telescope, which had been unknown in the time of Tycho, more accurate and extended observations, enabling Newton to subject to analysis the lunar inequalities, and to constitute astronomy a physical science by demonstrating its laws. From the year 1675, in which Flamsteed was nominated astronomer royal, the modern astronomy may properly be dated, the observations of Tycho, made about a century before without the telescope and the use of clocks, having been very rough and imperfect.

After all which Newton has accomplished, the superior power of his mind may seem to be best estimated from that, which in the actual state of physical science he could only conjecture, because in these instances he has most outstripped the general intelligence of his age. From their respective degrees of power in refracting light[49], he was led to conceive that the diamond is wholly, and water partly, composed of an inflammable substance; and the improved

[48] See account of the Rev. John Flamsteed by F. Baily, Esq., Lond. 1835. [49] Optice, lib. ii. part iii. prop. 10.

chemistry of our age has accordingly ascertained, that the former is pure *carbon*, and may be wholly consumed, and that the latter is formed partly of inflammable air. In his own science of light also he was, from the peculiarity of the refractive power of Iceland-crystal[50], led to anticipate the discovery of the *polarisation* of the rays of light, which attributes to corpuscles, minute beyond all imagination, sides possessed of contrary qualities, like the contrasted poles of magnetic substances.

While Newton was thus engaged in disclosing to the world the secrets of material nature, Locke was applying to the examination of the human mind the same process of observation, and giving a beginning to the modern metaphysics. Encouraged by the bold independence of the French philosopher Des Cartes, but with equal independence rejecting the novel theories[51], which that philosopher had substituted for the old, he investigated by actual experience the proceedings of the understanding in the acquisition of knowledge, prescribed methods of removing the difficulties opposed by the imperfections and abuses of language, and even marked the limits, by which the researches of our reason must naturally be bounded and confined. Defects, at the close of much more than a century, may now doubtless be

[50] Optice, lib. ii. part iii. quæst. 29. [51] Locke has strenuously combated two theories of Des Cartes, one relating to spirit, the other to matter. In regard to spirit he has effectually disproved the notion of innate ideas, and in regard to matter he has with equal success maintained that the ideas of body and extension had been improperly confounded. He seems however to have failed in his effort to prove that the soul does not always think, which he conceived, though erroneously, to be necessary to his argument disproving the existence of innate ideas. The recurrence, so commonly experienced, of an idea to the mind, when the effort to recover it had been abandoned as hopeless, and the attention had been directed to a wholly different train of thought, or perhaps suspended in sound sleep, seems explicable only by supposing, that the former train of thought had been continued after consciousness had ceased, and again attracted attention, when it had reached the desired idea. The analogical argument, that the act of thinking is not more necessary to the mind than the act of moving to the body, is destitute of foundation, for vitality is not separable from motion of some kind. Nor can a power so frequently auxiliary to memory as unconscious thought, be deemed useless; and surely the belief of its perpetual and inherent activity exalts our conception of the human soul.

perceived in his Essay on the Human Understanding, but it still remains a noble and instructive monument of original and practical observation.

The same philosopher, in the same year in which he published this work[52], gave also to the world his Treatise on Civil Government, which was long esteemed as the justification of the British revolution. While the succession established by that event was threatened by the pretensions of the exiled family, and the world had not yet been instructed in the evils of a subverted government, the principles of this treatise were not very jealously examined and it was admitted to be the plea of those, who had rescued the constitution from the tyranny and bigotry of James II. It has however been since perceived, that the theory of government, which it proposes, is irreconcilable to the cautious and moderate conduct of the statesmen[53], whom it professes to vindicate, and that the principle of free consent, which it maintains, tends by very direct inference to relax all the bands of political society. The principles of the true theory of our social relations appear to be, that every civilised man is born in, and for society; that every social combination of men, which possesses the efficient vigour of a government, is preferable to anarchy, and therefore is entitled to support; and that revolution is justifiable only when a government has, from whatsoever cause, so lost its efficiency, that violence cannot be necessary for accomplishing the change. These principles are sufficient to justify the British revolution,

[52] Both were published in the year 1690. The treatise on civil government appears to have been composed to vindicate the revolution, when the nonjuring bishops had revived an absurd treatise of Sir Robert Filmer, which traced the right of kings to the authority of the patriarchs. That on the human understanding had been long meditated and composed at Amsterdam before the revolution. In the former Locke appears to have combined the notion of the natural equality of men, maintained by Hobbes, with Hooker's notion of consent as the foundation of government. [53] The whole history of the revolution manifests an anxious desire to deviate as little as possible from the ordinary practice of the government, and even to disguise as much as was practicable the irregularity, which could not be avoided. There was accordingly no mention of cashiering the king. It was on the contrary earnestly insisted, that there was no dissolution of the government; and assemblages of the populace, though favourable to the revolution, were prohibited by proclamation. Moore's History of the Brit. Revol.., ch. iii. Burke's Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs.

for the military force employed was competent only to the prevention of disorder. Modern experience would not encourage us to embrace others less favourable to the stability of existing governments.

Of these two founders of English philosophy it should be remarked, that both were strongly attached to the Christian religion, and both exercised their faculties in illustrating the sacred writings. If the metaphysician was too eager to persuade himself, that the truths of religion must be strictly consonant to the natural apprehensions of his reason, yet the greater Newton [54] was sincere and zealous in his belief of its mysterious doctrines. The philosophy of the British empire has been from its first formation the ally of religion.

CHAPTER XIX.

Of the history of France, from the accession of Louis XIII. in the year 1610 *to the death of cardinal Mazarin in the year* 1661.

Louis XIII. king, in the year 1610—Richelieu minister, 1624—The Protestants finally reduced, 1629—Cardinal Mazarin minister, 1642—Louis XIV. king, 1643—War of the *fronde* begun, 1648—ended, 1652—The death of cardinal Mazarin, 1661.

THE history of France has been reviewed to the death of the celebrated Henry IV., which occurred eight years before the commencement of the great war of Germany. From that time, through the long period of fifty-one years ending with the death of cardinal Mazarin, the government seems to have made preparation for the splendid exertions of the reign of Louis XIV., which procured for France the predominance in the later period of the federative policy of Europe. By the death of the cardinal the king became emancipated from

[54] "We know," says Sir David Brewster, "that Sir Isaac Newton was greatly offended at Mr. Whiston, for having represented him as an Arian; and so much did he resent the conduct of his friend in ascribing to him heretical opinions, that he would not permit him to be elected a fellow of the Royal Society, while he was president."—Life of Sir I. Newton, p. 284. London, 1831.

the tutelage, in which he had been held by the cautious policy of that minister, and was left at liberty to engage in those enterprises of ambition, which changed the general system of political relations.

The edict of Nantes, which had guaranteed to the Protestants of France a political existence, and even a kind of republican independence[1] in the heart of the kingdom, could be but a temporary arrangement[2]. It gave to the Protestants the habit of acting as a body, and it animated them with the confidence belonging to successful resistance; but it presented them to the government in a hostile and alarming position, and was sure to bring against them the full exertion of its power, as soon as they should have lost Henry IV. their friend and protector. Louis XIII. accordingly was scarcely seated on the throne, when the court began to adopt measures unfriendly to the Protestants. As the king was then only nine years old, the government was administered by his mother in the character of regent. This princess immediately embraced a new plan of policy, by courting the alliance of Spain, with the royal family of which country she negotiated two treaties of marriage, one for the young king, the other for his sister. Her change of policy alarmed the Protestants[3], already by the assassination of Henry IV. convinced of the relentless bigotry of their adversaries; and they in consequence commenced hostilities, which at the end of seventeen years were concluded by the entire reduction of their party.

The reign of Louis XIII., which was extended to thirty-three years, may notwithstanding be considered as a perpetual minority, the superior mind of Richelieu having succeeded to the authority previously exercised, first by the queen regent, and then by a favourite, and having to the end of his life, which preceded the death of the king by only six months, maintained an entire ascendency. Even after the death of this minister[4] his influence survived, and deter-

[1] After the apostasy of Henry IV. they refused to nominate another protector from the great, committing the management of their interests to a sort of states general of the sect.—Eclaircissemens Historiques sur les Causes de la Révocation de l'Edit de Nantes, tome i. pp. 12, 13.

[2] Mably, tome iii. pp. 263, &c. Eclairc. Hist., tome i. pp. 14, 15.

[3] Mably, tome iii. p. 261.

[4] L'Intrigue du Cabinet sous Henri IV. et Louis XIII. par Anquetil, tome iii. pp. 135, 136. Paris, 1780.

mined the choice of his successor, the cardinal Mazarin. Richelieu indeed deserved to govern the kingdom and the king. Comprehensive in his views, and vigorous in his measures, he reduced to order an unsettled government, developed and improved its yet latent energies, and directed them with success to the adjustment of the political interests of Europe.

Louis on the other hand does not seem to have been deficient in understanding, and, having acquired the surname of the *just*, must have been respected for his moral qualities[5]. Though indeed he appears to have been by nature[6] destined to be directed by others, he was however far from being a mere puppet[7], guided mechanically by whoever happened to be near him. He is described by historians[8] as passive in the general habits of his character, but yet struggling from time to time against the ascendency of his minister, and yielding to him only in a conviction of the wisdom of his measures. Inert, but not destitute of the ability of a sovereign; sensible of the merit of his minister, yet struggling against his superiority; such was the monarch, whose reign, begun by a feeble and distracted regency, was afterwards by the genius of Richelieu rendered the period of the exaltation of the royal authority at home, and distinguished abroad for the successful exertion of the power of France in adjusting the interests of Europe. To the actual circumstances of his country he was particularly suited[9]. He would have been too weak for the embarrassing situation of his father Henry IV., and too circumspect for the brilliant career of his son Louis XIV.; but his cold and cautious prudence qualified him to establish the yet tottering throne of the one, and to prepare his country for the splendid exertions of the other.

The regency of the queen-mother, and the ministry of the favourite, by whom she was succeeded, formed a fit prelude

[5] St. Simon has related an instance, in which this prince very decisively repulsed a proposal made to him by his father, of negotiating an intrigue between him and a Mademoiselle d'Hautefort, to whom he was much attached.—Supp. au Mémoires, tome ii. p. 343.

[6] L'Intrigue du Cabinet, tome ii. p. 77. [7] When Richelieu, having lost Corbie to the Spaniards, would have retired beyond the Seine, he overruled the minister.—St. Simon, Supp., tome ii. p. 336.

[8] Henault, vol. ii. p. 88. L'Intrigue du Cabinet, tome ii. pp. 195, &c.

[9] Henault, vol. ii. p. 88.

for the administration of Richelieu. Fond of intrigue, but ignorant of true policy, the queen, herself an Italian[10], abandoned herself to a partiality for an obscure native of her own country, and drove from her court into a sort of imperfect rebellion[11] the grandees of both the great parties, which had long agitated the state. These grandees were however very different from their fathers, who had contended for dominion. Theirs was a struggle only for ascendency at court[12], for they had already proved by their subserviency to a favourite, that they were actuated by no other principle than an unsatisfied avidity. To pacify the malecontents[13] an assembly of the states was convened, the last except that which in the year 1789 subverted the government. Destitute of all interest in the public welfare[14], this assembly just served to prove to the people of France its entire inutility, and to explode all reliance upon an expedient so unavailing. But at the moment[15], in which these cabals seemed to threaten the kingdom with the calamities of a distracted government, appeared the superior genius, by whose commanding administration every thing was rectified, these very agitations being rendered instrumental to the exaltation of the royal authority.

The ecclesiastical state, in which Richelieu had engaged[16], forbade him to aspire to the possession of independent power, and in France it would not then have been practicable to establish the dominion of the church. The minister accordingly devoted to the aggrandisement of his sovereign all the resources of a mind, capable of defying and subduing the resistance of a discontented nobility. The king on the other hand, who, when he first assumed the government had attached himself for a short time to a favourite[17] as little capable of directing it, as the favourite of his mother, confided thenceforward, though not implicitly, the management of

[10] She was the daughter of Francis, great duke of Tuscany.

[11] Henault, vol. ii. p. 34. L'Intrigue du Cabinet, tome i. pp. 319, &c.

[12] L'Intrigue du Cabinet, tome i. pp. 290, &c. [13] In the year 1614, an assembly of the notables equally frivolous was convened at Rouen, and another at the Thuilleries in the year 1626.—Ibid., tome ii. pp. 78—81, 259. [14] Mably, tome iii. pp. 277—279.

[15] Ibid., p. 285. [16] He was bishop of Luçon in the year 1616, when he was made secretary. In the year 1624 he became a cardinal.

[17] The constable de Luynes.

affairs to the zeal of his minister. The vigour of the minister was controlled by the circumspection of the monarch, while the violent measures employed for the reduction of a turbulent aristocracy, were felt by the public to have been rather suggested by the minister, than dictated by the sovereign.

The reduction of the Protestants[18] was a principal object of his administration, for their privileges rendered them formidable to the state, and useful allies to every party of the discontented. He proposed this object however as a politician, not as a persecutor. He resolved[19] to deprive them of all political strength as a party, but he did not exclude them from an entire toleration as a sect. In accomplishing this purpose, he made preparation for that other, of reducing the nobles, which was at the time perceived by one of that order.

For bringing the nobility to depend upon the crown[20], he extended over the whole kingdom an active system of espionage, and employed even the administration of justice as the instrument of his policy, reducing to practice the maxims of government, which Machiavel had inculcated, and either destroying on the scaffold, or sending into exile, every noble, who would not be subservient to his will. Even the mother of the king[21], forced into a necessitous banishment, exhibited a striking example of the futility of all attempts to oppose this extraordinary minister, which confounded the schemes of his enemies.

The assembly of the states, convened in the year 1614, seems as if it had been held only for justifying the arbitrary policy of Richelieu, by demonstrating that the aggrandisement of the royal power was the only constitutional improvement accommodated to the circumstances of France. The great trunk of the modern policy of Europe appears to have been unavoidably disqualified for those nicer processes of political combination, which might be elaborated in some of its branches. The feudal habits, which were indispensably prevalent in the central government of the system, seem to have been incapable of furnishing any other result, consistently with the unity of the government, than the establishment of a military monarchy. In this government accordingly the

[18] Mably, tome iii. p. 287.
[19] Eclairc. Hist., tome i. pp. 16, 17.
[20] Mably, tome iii. p. 293.
[21] L'Intrigue du Cabinet, tome ii. p. 87.

administration of Richelieu was, what the revolution of the year 1688 was in our own, the crisis which closed the long series of the public agitations, and gave to the constitution the perfection belonging to its principles. It did not erect a system of civil liberty, for the ground-work of civil liberty did not exist among the French; but it gave consistency and vigour to the monarchy, enabling it to be the instrument of much domestic improvement, and to maintain with Austria a successful struggle for predominance in the general combination of European policy.

The beneficial effects of his government were in part achieved by Richelieu himself. He[22] procured the establishment of the French academy, and furnished it with endowments and privileges, which secured its stability. To him[23] was France indebted for the first encouragement of maritime commerce, when it had been wholly suppressed by two centuries of foreign or domestic war. To animate the enterprise of the people, he caused himself to be appointed superintendent of commerce, interested himself in the undertakings of mercantile companies associated under his protection, and a short time before his death formed by the consolidation of all these societies the company of the Indies. But the splendid and distinguished object of his administration was his strenuous exertion of the power of France for the reduction of the then predominating greatness of the house of Austria. To this all the measures of his policy appear to have been subordinate. The French Protestants he deprived of an independence not compatible with the unity of the government; the great nobles he brought down from their feudal haughtiness to an acknowledgment of the supremacy of the royal authority; the various resources of the country, which he governed, he sedulously cultivated and improved: all these efforts however found a common result in the exertions, by which the ambition of Austria was resisted, and compelled to confine itself within limits prescribed by the general interests of Europe. As the administration of Richelieu constituted in the history of France a crisis, corresponding to that of the

[22] L'Intrigue du Cabinet, tome ii. p. 437; tome iii. p. 139.

[23] Ibid., tome ii. p. 489. The marine, which he began, was suffered to decay in the time of Mazarin.—L'Esprit de la Fronde, tome iii. p. 38. Paris. 1772.

revolution in the history of England, so was it likewise the period, in which the government of the former country was successfully opposed to the predominance of Austria, as towards the close of the same century the reign of William, with similar success, opposed the resources of the improved government of these countries to the usurping ambition of France.

It was perhaps unavoidable, that the first efforts to constitute a system of federative policy should be perverted by that unprincipled policy, which regards expediency as a sufficient justification of unprovoked aggression. It is indeed not unnatural that a statesman, who must be guided by a consideration of expediency even in maintaining an unequivocal right, should be brought to think, that it is in every case a justifying principle of political conduct. A melancholy series of unwarrantable aggression may accordingly be traced from Richelieu's encroachment on the independence of Savoy[24], through the treaty proposing to partition the territories of Spain at the close of the same century, and the actual partitions of Poland in that which succeeded, to the grand consummation of this mischievous policy in the establishment of the dominion of France over almost the whole of western Europe. May we hope that mankind, instructed by the calamities with which this spurious policy at length overwhelmed the continent of Europe, will learn to separate from it the true principles of a balanced policy, and to form a system not containing within itself the cause of its own dissolution?

It is remarkable that three contemporary monarchs of this period suffered themselves to be guided by their respective ministers; the king of France by cardinal Richelieu, the king of Spain by count Olivarez, and the king of England by the duke of Buckingham. It may be added, that the very various characters of the ministers appear to have borne an apt correspondence to the respective situations of

[24] In the struggle between France and Austria it was the interest of Savoy to remain neuter. This however did not suit the views of the French minister, and he assumed, through the influence of the widow of the duke, sister of the king of France, an entire and absolute dominion over the counsels of that state, being perhaps says Anquetil, the first politician, who exhibited to the world the scandalous example of usurpation covered by the appearance of protection.—L'Intrigue du Cabinet, tome iii. pp. 26—37.

the three countries. France, which was then struggling to repress the inordinate ambition of Austria, and to place itself in the station of protector of the liberties of Europe, was governed by the profound and energetic policy of Richelieu. Spain, which assisted in maintaining the cause of Austria, but was in each successive year receding further from the pre-eminence, which it had enjoyed in the preceding century, was administered by the rash vigour of Olivarez, an unequal, but not contemptible antagonist. England, which had then little or no concern with the political interests of the continent, and was tending rapidly towards the crisis of its domestic agitations, was directed by the vain imbecility of Buckingham. The active genius of the cardinal appears to have been exerted in every direction around the country, which he superintended. While he negotiated with the Dutch, the Danes, and the Swedes, and assisted them in their hostilities against Austria in Germany, he attacked the Austrian power in Italy, he waged a successful war against Spain, he supported, though he did not instigate[25], the insurrection of Calabria, and he connected himself with the Puritans of England[26], with the Covenanters of Scotland[27], and probably with the Roman Catholics of Ireland.

Louis XIII., who had been so much guided by this extraordinary minister, survived him but a few months, and then transmitted his kngdom to a minority, of which another cardinal exercised the exclusive direction. Historians appear to have delighted in contrasting the subtle and insinuating policy of Mazarin to the bold and overbearing energy of Richelieu. No two able ministers could have been more different, yet the system of the public measures [28] was not changed. Mazarin had been the pupil of Richelieu, he had adopted in all things his principles of policy, and he pursued them with not less ardour and constancy, though with a cautious and temporising address. The artful management

[25] This appears from the narrative of Assarino, in his Rivolutioni di Catalogna, Bologna, 1648. [26] This is positively asserted by Whitelocke, in his Memorials, p. 22. [27] Hallam's Constit. Hist., vol. ii. p. 20, note. [28] Il (le cardinal de Mazarin) se fit un principe de demeurer uni avec tout ce qui avoit tenu au cardinal de Richelieu, qu'il appeloit toujours son maître.—Mém. de St. Simon, Supp. tome ii. p. 215.

of the Italian accordingly completed what had been begun by the daring vigour of the French cardinal, the two ecclesiastics being alike disposed to exalt the royal authority on the humiliation of the nobles and the parliament of Paris.

Mazarin could not have adequately discharged the function of his predecessor, who had died at the end of the year 1642, between five and six years before the termination of the protracted negotiations of Westphalia. When however these negotiations had begun to be important, and the war to be subordinate to their progress, the crafty genius of Mazarin was best fitted to conduct the great struggle to a conclusion which is the true epoch of the federative policy of Europe. New disturbances occurred in France in the same year, in which the peace of Westphalia was concluded; but these were of a kind well accommodated to the timid and artful character of the latter minister, who so managed them as to lead them to an issue favourable to the power of the crown. These disturbances too, it should be remarked, were just sufficient to incapacitate France for making such an impression on the Spanish territory, the war with Spain being still continued, as might have impaired the independence of that government, without however disabling it for strengthening its own frontiers, both on the north and on the south, by various important acquisitions.

The leader of the new disturbances of France was, like the minister, an ecclesiastic. He was at length raised to the rank of cardinal, and is commonly mentioned by the title of the cardinal de Retz; but at this time he was coadjutor of the archbishop of Paris, and his great instrument of sedition was the influence [29], which he exercised over the turbulent spirits of the capital, by the agency of the parochial clergy, who were attached to him for his hypocritical zeal and eminent ability. The last struggle of the parties of France was thus maintained under the direction of two ecclesiastical leaders, Mazarin supporting the authority of the crown, while the malecontents were headed by De Retz. The ecclesiastical character of the ministry since the advancement of

[29] This he had gained by favouring the Jansenists, who had been persecuted by Richelieu, and were on that account hostile to Mazarin, whom they considered as his pupil.—L'Esprit de la Fronde, tome ii. pp. 214—216. Paris, 1772.

Richelieu had separated the executive authority from the nobility; and that of the leader of sedition seems to have had a similar operation in detaching the malecontents from so close connexion with the nobles, as might have led them to an open rebellion. Thus on both parts was the feudal aristocracy of France excluded from political importance.

These disturbances, in which the discontent generated by the severe government of Richelieu feebly exploded, have been distinguished by the name of the *fronde*, an appellation ludicrously derived from the daily contests between the police-guard of Paris and the children [30], who amused themselves with discharging stones from slings in the trenches of that capital, the alternate boldness and timidity of these young combatants having suggested a comparison between them and the unsteady opponents of the minister. They were indeed maintained by a party so incongruous, that no systematic plan of action could be steadily pursued, and no one distinct object, except the removal of the minister, could even be proposed [31].

Richelieu, in suppressing all opposition to the prerogative, repelled the pretensions of the parliament of Paris, which had with unabated perseverance endeavoured to raise itself from the rank of a judicial tribunal to that of a national council, the approbation of which should be necessary for sanctioning the ordinances of the crown. In this struggle the parliament was forced to yield to a minister, by whom the Protestants and the nobles had been already humbled; but their discontent, which fermented in secret, manifested itself when a minor sovereign, and a minister less daring, and as a foreigner less supported by connexions, afforded a more favourable opportunity for vindicating their claims. Even then however it was necessary for them to seek assistance, wherever it could be procured. An unnatural union was accordingly effected by this society of magistrates with the discontented nobles [32], and, as if to render the combination as heterogeneous as possible, the whole machine of sedition was directed by the intrigues of an ambitious ecclesiastic. The result was, as Mably has justly characterised it, perhaps the most ridiculous war, which has been recorded

[30] L'Intrigue du Cabinet, tome iii. pp. 217, 218. [31] Ibid., p. 311.
[32] Mably, tome iii. pp. 294—296.

in history. De Retz, anxious to possess himself of that exalted station, which had been successively occupied by two ecclesiastics, took care to direct to the removal of Mazarin the general clamour of his party, but without particularising his successor, or specifying the principles, which he should be required to observe ; and, while a war was waged against the confidential minister of the crown[33], all his adversaries were eager to testify their unshaken fidelity to the sovereign.

This strange assemblage of faction may be regarded as completing by its discomfiture the success of the administration of Richelieu. The French became weary of all opposition to the royal pleasure. Experience had amply taught them the futility of their endeavours to introduce into their government the principles of freedom; and they were at length prepared to seek in the splendour of the reign of Louis XIV. the consolation of a brilliant servitude.

Among the remarkable peculiarities of this insurrection was the important influence exercised by the women, preparatory, as it seems, to the ascendency enjoyed by them in the succeeding century. The female sex had begun to attend the court of France almost a century and a half before this time[34], having been drawn thither by Anne of Brittany, the queen of Louis XII. ; but, as that prince did not give them much attention, their brilliant appearance commenced in the reign of his successor Francis I. Three female regencies afterwards enhanced the credit of the sex, which acquired yet more influence from the amorous propensities of Henry IV. When the women had thus been introduced into all the intercourses of society, the endless cabals of the *fronde* afforded an ample opportunity for exercising their influence. A woman was the soul of every council[35], and a revolution in the heart of a female announced almost uniformly another in the public affairs. A curious conversation[36], between Mazarin the French minister and Don Louis de Haro the prime minister of Spain, contrasts in a very striking manner the ladies of the two countries, in one of

[33] L'Intrigue du Cabinet, tome iii. p. 368.. L'Esprit de la Fronde, tome ii. p. 229. [34] Henault, vol. i. p, 383. [35] Thomas sur les Femmes, p. 160. Paris, 1772. [36] L'Intrigue du Cabinet, tome iii. pp. 382, 383.

which they had become politicians, in the other had continued to maintain merely the social importance of the sex. The French congratulates the Spanish minister on the good fortune of his country, in being exempted from a cause of confusion, greater than any which had been known at Babel. The Spaniard in reply expresses his thankfulness for the different disposition of the women of his country, who, if they received money from their husbands, or from their gallants, were completely satisfied, and felt no ambition of concerning themselves with the interests of the state. The conduct of these female politicians of France was not very scrupulously regulated by decorum. Their interviews were almost always held at night[37], and the ladies in their beds received their negotiators; and such is the force of the prejudice of party, as De Retz the great master of faction has well observed, that the public allowed these violations of decency to pass without any animadversion. It has been[38] well observed of the spirit of female intrigue, which had thus been generated in France, that it made the women in general agreeable intelligent companions, and sometimes inestimable friends; but that the neglect of all the severer virtues so deteriorated the female character, and so banished all truth of principle from its social relations, that perhaps nothing less than the dreadful remedy administered by the revolution could have awakened them to a sense of their real interests, and restored the women of France to their true and appropriate consideration in society.

An insurrection, the professed object of which was the removal of the obnoxious minister of a regency, was naturally concluded in the year preceding that, in which the sovereign received the crown. The royal authority[39], strengthened by the very shocks, which it had sustained, began from this time to display that vigour, which continually increased through the protracted reign of Louis XIV. All opposition had been discomfited and discredited, nor did any domestic discontent remain to divert the attention of the government from the enterprises of foreign ambition. The administration of Mazarin was however continued about nine

[37] L'Intrigue du Cabinet, tome iv. p. 69. [38] England and France, &c., vol. i. p. 167.—Lond. 1834. [39] L'Esprit de la Fronde, tome v. pp. 813, 814.

years longer, during which time his peculiar character was actively exercised in making preparation for the subsequent efforts of this important reign. The predominant passion of Richelieu had been the love of aggrandising the power of the crown, that of Mazarin was an anxiety to improve its finances[40]. The former principle having produced its full effect, the latter was then required to make preparation for great military exertions.

It is impossible to review the history of France during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, without being forcibly impressed by the different circumstances and results of the struggles of the religious and political parties of that country and England, which yet in some particulars exhibited a correspondence. In each country a sect of presbyterian Protestants opposed the established religion, and was led by its ecclesiastical principles to assert a civil independence; and in each was also formed a political party[41], which laboured to transform the monarchy into a republic. But in the history of England we observe these two parties struggling with united efforts to reduce the power of the crown; in that of France we see them exerting their efforts in two distinct periods, the religious struggle of the *league* having been concluded nineteen years before the commencement of the political struggle of the *fronde*. In England accordingly a great impulse was given to the government, which after an alternate movement settled in the central position of a regulated freedom, whereas in France the two parties separately exhausted their powers, the religious party having been first reduced to submission.

The causes of these distinctions, so important in regard to the subsequent fortunes of the government, may be satisfactorily assigned. The Presbyterians of England contended for liberty under a government of Protestants, with the independent party of whom they could for a time coalesce into one powerful opposition within the constitutional forms of the country. Those of France were opposed to a government of Roman Catholics, from all the orders, and even the

[40] This distinction was marked in the following epigram:
Fata duos regni nobis rapuere ministros;
Sustulit ille bonos, abstulit iste bona.—L'Esp. de la Fr. v. p. 706.

[41] Ibid., p. 64.

factions of which, they were necessarily alien, and not affording any national assembly, in which their pretensions could be proposed and discussed. The assemblies of the states[42] had been so degraded in the public estimation, that their nature and character were forgotten. The parliament, in attempting to assume a legislative character, was impelled to connect itself with malecontents, wherever to be found; but the Protestants[43] stood aloof from a body, which had ordained an annual commemoration of the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day[44], and established a regular Inquisition for the detection of Protestants; and left them to demonstrate, by their vain, and even ludicrous efforts, how incapable was the French people of maintaining a struggle for freedom[45]. A single instance sufficiently characterises the difference of the two nations in their political proceedings. The independent party in England proceeded against the earl of Strafford by a parliamentary impeachment, but that of France could devise no better expedient for freeing themselves from an obnoxious minister, than to outlaw him, and set a price upon his head[46].

The administration of Mazarin lasted just long enough after the termination of the *fronde*, for concluding the war with Spain by the peace of the Pyrenees, a principal article of which was the stipulation for the marriage of the king with the infanta. Fourteen years before, when the cardinal was directing the negotiations of Westphalia[47], this alliance had been a favourite object of his policy, as leading with

[42] Mably, tome iii. p. 185. [43] L'Esprit de la Fronde, tome v. p. 763. [44] Mably, tome iii. p. 185. [45] The party of the nobles, by which the parliament endeavoured to strengthen itself, is disgracefully distinguished in history by having given birth to the character and appellation of the *petit maitre*, the personified frivolity of the nation.—Le Siècle de Louis XIV., tome i. p. 78. Londres, 1752. [46] It is creditable to the nation, that this price, 150,000 livres, did not tempt any individual to offer violence to the cardinal, though in the time of the *league* a similar proscription had caused the death of the admiral de Coligny. Mazarin may indeed have been indebted for his safety to his character of a prince of the church, on account of which the clergy of France declaimed vehemently against the edict. He was also protected by ridicule, Marigny having published a tarif, specifying the several portions of the sum, to which various lesser injuries, inflicted on the person of the cardinal, might afford pretensions.—L'Esprit de la Fronde, tome iv. pp. 728, 729. [47] Henault, vol. ii. p. 136.

much probability to the succession of the crown of Spain. He was then disappointed by the obstinacy, with which the Spaniards refused to accede to the treaty, and the war was continued, until they had been reduced to a more compliant temper. In this interval occurred the sedition of the *fronde*, which the patient address of the minister enabled him to sustain, while he conducted a languid war against the wasted power of that foreign enemy, being assisted in it by the discontent of the turbulent Catalonians [48]. The same minister had thus the extraordinary fortune of concluding the peace of Westphalia, which first established a balance of power in Europe by opposing France to Austria; of suppressing, or rather of exhausting, the last remnant of domestic discontent, and thus preparing France for the uncontrolled exertion of the whole power of the government; and of accomplishing the Spanish negotiation, which eventually transferred the Spanish crown from the reigning family of Austria to that of France, and thus established the predominance of the latter in the combinations of Europe.

The functions of this minister appear to have been discharged in the completion of these important measures, after which his administration was speedily terminated by his death. Within little more than a year from the conclusion of the peace of the Pyrenees, the death of Mazarin left Louis XIV. at liberty to develope all the energies of his government, and to give a beginning to a new period of the policy of Europe. Austria was accordingly by his efforts removed from that pre-eminence of power, which had been adjusted by the treaty of Westphalia; and, while France assumed the station of the principal member of the system, a distinct series of events constituted the British government the rival state, and the protector of the general independence.

[48] The French had availed themselves of it to establish themselves within their province, which they ceased to occupy only a few months before the suppression of the troubles of their own country.—Mém. de Louis XIV. et XV., par Millot, tome i. p. 318. Paris, 1777.

CHAPTER XX.

Of the history of France, from the death of cardinal Mazarin in the year 1661 *to the grand alliance formed against France in the year* 1689.

War of the right of devolution, in the year 1667—Triple alliance and peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, 1668—War with the Dutch, 1672—Alliance against France, 1674—Peace of Nimeguen, 1678—Chamber of reunion, 1680—Liberties of the Gallican church asserted, 1682—Revocation of the edict of Nantes, 1685—League of Augsburg, 1686—First grand alliance, 1689.

THE age of Louis XIV. claims to be considered as the fourth of those distinguished periods of the history of our species, which form the fertile *oases* of its intellectual progress amidst the uniform and wearying wastes of violence and ambition. It is consoling to the philosophic student of history to discover these refreshing interruptions of the tiresome series of national contentions, especially as they have regularly occurred just when those contentions had reached an extreme of violence, which threatened an hopeless succession of savage animosity.

The concluding age of the great contest of Greece and Persia, the age of Philip and Alexander, was the most brilliant period of those illustrious republics, to which every friend of human refinement is accustomed to look back with almost religious veneration. The age of Augustus, which closed the devastations of Roman ambition, was adorned with such a combination of mental excellence, that it has furnished an appellation for every succeeding period of mental improvement. The age of Leo, which followed the feudal barbarity of modern Europe, was the bright dawn of returning literature and art. The period of those mighty struggles, which established for a century the federative relations of Europe, was distinguished by an expansive energy of intellect which corresponded in dignity to the great crisis of the political history of the west.

In all these cases indeed the principles of intellectual improvement had first been introduced, and were afterwards but developed by the strong excitement of the public agita-

tion. Uncivilised man appears to be doomed to follow one unvarying course of violence, which no more improves his social situation, than the ravages of the brute inhabitants of the forest tend to raise them to the condition of humanity. It is when the principles of intellectual improvement have been previously mingled in the mass, that the strong fermentation, generated in the combination of human passions, sends forth the powers, which exalt and adorn our nature. The disturbed scene of political struggle then constitutes a moral chaos, over which the spirit of our Maker moves, as over the primordial mass of the material world; and the light of intellectual refinement springs at the high bidding of his providential government from the elemental conflict of the violences of his creatures.

France, at the decease of cardinal Mazarin, was in a condition, which especially qualified it for claiming and maintaining an ascendency among the states of Europe. Having just then concluded the last of its civil contentions, it possessed all the spring of character, which would enable it to make a powerful impression on the neighbouring governments; and the final suppression of the pretensions of every order of subjects had placed at the disposal of the sovereign the whole of the resources of that rich and populous country. The administration of Richelieu had humbled the Huguenots and the nobles; that of Mazarin had exhausted in a commotion, which was even ludicrous, the ambition of the parliament and the sedition of the capital; and the French of every class were at this time prepared to regard the authority of the sovereign as the only principle of the public measures, and eager to direct to some external object that spirit of enterprise, which could no longer find employment at home.

In circumstances thus favourable began the immediate government of a sovereign, who seems to have been specially gifted for the station, which he filled. Fond of the pageantry of a court[1], and possessing those personal qualities, which fitted him to excel in its pompous ceremonial, he attracted the reverence of the multitude, and commanded the respect of his courtiers; indefatigable in his application to business, he drew the consideration of all public affairs to himself, and

[1] St. Simon, tome i. p. 11.

rendered his ministers but the agents of the determinations, which they had assisted him to form; and, though dazzled by the glare of ambition, and bigoted in his notions of religion, yet being sincerely desirous of advancing the interests of his people, he gave a steadiness to the political machine, which enabled it to withstand the most formidable shocks. He does not appear to have possessed extraordinary talents[2]; but he was capable of deriving improvement from every example of excellence, and he was the universal patron of literary genius[3]. His private conduct was licentious, and encouraged the abuses of a pleasurable court; but he never wholly abandoned his respect for decorum, and the recovered virtue of his mind at length directed him to an attachment, of which virtue combined with talent constituted the attraction.

If Louis XIV. had been one of those extraordinary men, who seem to have been formed to decide the destinies of nations, the ascendency, which he must have acquired, might have been fatal to the liberties of Europe. Instead of this he was[4], in the commencement of his actual government, surrounded by men endowed with all the talents, which the preceding agitations of the country had been fitted to draw forth, and to improve. Of the services of these survivors of the public commotions he availed himself in the earlier part of his government, in which he alarmed the other powers of Europe into a general combination of resistance; and, when these superior men had been removed from the political scene, his jealousy of self-direction, which would not suffer them to be succeeded by others like themselves, relaxed the efforts so formidable to the neighbouring states, and reduced him to a necessity of yielding to that arrangement of the general interests, which constituted the new order of federa-

[2] St. Simon, tome i. pp. 9, 32, 33.

[3] The duke de St. Aignan having remarked to the king, that cardinal Richelieu had sent presents to some learned foreigners, by whom he had been eulogised, he recommended to his ministers to select a number of persons, Frenchmen and foreigners, distinguished for literature, to whom he should send proofs of his generosity. A list of sixty persons was accordingly prepared, to some of whom presents were given, to others pensions. Among the foreigners were J. Vossius, the historiographer of the United Provinces, and Huygens the mathematician.—Siècle de Louis XIV., tome ii. p. 37.

[4] St. Simon, tome i. pp. 9, 10.

tive policy. The reign of this prince, from the death of the cardinal Mazarin, appears accordingly to be divisible into two parts of directly opposite characters, the earlier a period of haughty and alarming ambition, the later a period of public embarrassment and confusion. Throughout the two he acted for himself, and with the same views of vain-glorious aggrandisement; but he acted in them with instruments of very unequal powers, and consequently with very unequal efficacy.

It is deserving of attention, that in the year preceding that of the death of cardinal Mazarin the family of the Stuarts was restored to the throne of these countries. The time was then approaching, when William was to engage the British government in the antigallican alliances of the continent, and to transfer to it from his own republic the office of opposing and controlling the overbearing violence of France. Preparatory to this function of the British government was the close connexion, which the re-establishment of the Stuarts occasioned for a time between the future rivals in the European system. Depending on the treacherous assistance of France for support, in their unwarrantable enterprises against the freedom and the religion of their people, these ill-directed monarchs at once alarmed the prince of Orange with the apprehension of a confederacy dangerous to the independence of Europe, and their own subjects with the dread of tyranny and persecution. The later period of the British dynasty of the Stuarts was accordingly coincident in its commencement with the active government of the sovereign, whose ambition was to be restrained by the revolutionized government of Britain. The grand action and the underplot of the political drama began and proceeded together.

Louis, in the very commencement of his immediate government, manifested the high tone, which he chose to assume among the potentates of Europe. The Spanish court was compelled to desist from a pretension of precedency maintained by its ambassadors in London, and even to announce its humiliation by despatching an extraordinary ambassador to the court of France. The court of Rome too, once so much dreaded by the secular governments, was treated with the same air of commanding superiority. The attendants of the French ambassador in Rome having in-

sulted the police-guard of the pontiff, the violence was retaliated by an assault committed on the residence and the equipage of the ambassador. The county of Avignon was immediately seized by the French monarch, for the purpose of enforcing the satisfaction, to which he deemed himself entitled, and the[5] pope was reduced to the necessity of complying with the most mortifying demands.

The year 1667, which was six years later than the death of Mazarin, was the epoch of those aggressions, which alarmed the apprehensions of Europe, and gave occasion to the combination, by which the new system of its interests was arranged. Upon the death of the king of Spain, who by a former consort had been father to the queen of France, a claim was advanced to the inheritance of the Spanish Netherlands, founded on an alleged usage peculiar to some of those provinces[6]. The Spanish monarch having had by his second queen a male successor, it was reserved for a later period of the reign of Louis XIV. to aspire to place a prince of the house of Bourbon on the throne of that country. The alliance negotiated for Louis XIV. by the crafty Mazarin thus procured for the crown of France pretensions to the same territories, which about a century and a half before had so essentially contributed to the greatness of Austria. These two pretensions were the hinges, on which turned the arrangement of the French period of the policy of Europe. The war occasioned by the pretension to the Netherlands brought forward the illustrious prince of Orange, and gave being to the combination of the freedom and power of the British government with the independence of the continent: that occasioned by the claim of the succession of Spain on the other hand established the ascendency of France, by

[5] He was compelled to banish from Rome his own brother, to send his nephew, the cardinal Chigi, as a legate *a latere*, to make satisfaction to the king, to disband the Corsican guard, and to erect in Rome a pyramid, on which were recorded the injury and the reparation; some years afterwards however Louis permitted the pyramid to be destroyed. The court of Rome was likewise compelled to restore Castro and Conciglione to the duke of Parma, and to indemnify the duke of Modena for his claims on Commachio, the king thus drawing from an insult the honour of being the protector of the princes of Italy.—Siècle de Louis XIV., tome i. pp. 133, 134. [6] By this usage property devolved to the children of a first marriage, when the parent had engaged in a second.

transferring the monarchy of that country from the family of Austria to that of Bourbon.

The king of France, aided by Colbert, who had multiplied the resources of the state, and by Louvois, who first reduced to a system the war-department of the government, made a deep impression on the distant and ill-protected dependencies of the decaying monarchy of Spain. The influence of the balancing policy was however speedily manifested[7], a treaty of triple alliance being suddenly concluded between Great Britain, the Dutch republic and Sweden. Alarmed at this combination, the French king deemed it necessary to accede to a proposal of the allied powers; but by the treaty concluded at Aix-la-Chapelle in the following year he retained possession of Spanish Flanders, which enabled him to command an entrance into the United Provinces.

This earliest confederacy was speedily dissipated, though the three powers had engaged to guarantee the treaty. Charles II. of England was soon seduced from it by Louis, who undertook to supply the necessities of his profusion, and Sweden was without much difficulty brought back to its habitual dependence on the subsidies of France. The emperor also being at this time occupied by the disturbances of Hungary, the United Provinces, distracted by the struggles of the republicans and the partisans of the house of Orange, were exposed without any protection to the resentment[8] and the ambition of the neighbouring monarch. Some pretended insults were alleged to justify the aggressions of a new confederacy, in which France was aided by Great Britain and two German principalities adjacent to the republic. Three of the seven provinces were then almost immediately overrun. Amsterdam itself appears to have been saved only by a brief opportunity of inundating the neighbouring country[9]; and the more considerable families began

[7] The contracting powers agreed to compel the two belligerents to consent to certain terms of accommodation, which they should propose.

[8] The determination of the confederated states, engaged in the triple alliance, to compel the consent of France, was one of the principal causes of the war afterwards waged by Louis against the republic.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. pp. 189, 190. [9] One instant of diligence, says Voltaire, would have placed Amsterdam in the power of the king, The delay was caused by the war-minister Louvois, who wished to proceed regularly with the fortified places, leaving

to take measures for seeking in Batavia that independence, which seemed to have been lost in Europe.

From this immense disproportion of the means of attack and of resistance the divine Providence appears to have drawn forth the arrangements of the new system of policy. If the United Provinces had been more able to struggle with their enemies, other governments would have been less alarmed, and therefore less disposed to enter into the combinations, which generated the new political order. The chief too of a more considerable state might have been to the people of Great Britain an object of political apprehension, instead of being hailed as their deliverer from tyranny and persecution. If on the other hand the British nation had not been brought into an impolitic connexion with France by princes, whom it justly regarded as the enemies of its freedom and religion, it would probably have been alienated by commercial rivalry from a political connexion with the United Provinces.

Perhaps the whole range of human history does not present two distinguished and eminent characters more perfectly contrasted than Louis XIV. and the prince of Orange, nor more remarkably adapted to their respective situations. The French monarch, vain-glorious, ambitious, and bigoted, was fitted to cherish the pride of his own subjects and to alarm the apprehensions of other nations. The Dutch prince, indifferent to pageantry, cold and repulsive in his demeanour, tolerant in his notions of religion, and solicitous only for the independence of Europe, could neither flatter the vanity of his countrymen, nor excite in other states distrust and resistance. The characteristics of his spirit were fortitude, which no danger could dismay, integrity, which malignity could not discredit, patient perseverance, which opposition and embarrassment could not exhaust. His aggrandisement was the work of the exigencies of his country and of Europe, not of personal ambition. Though the splendour of an ostentatious monarchy has bestowed upon this period the name of the age of Louis, a philosophical inquirer must discover in the Dutch prince the informing soul of all its political arrangements.

The war, begun with the Dutch in the year 1672, was

garrisons in them as they were reduced.—Siècle de Louis XIV., tome i. pp. 182, 192, 193.

terminated six years afterwards by the peace of Nimeguen, the terms of which were dictated by France, though, in the design of detaching the United Provinces from the confederacy formed for their protection[10], Maestricht and its dependencies, all which remained of the conquests made from the republic, were surrendered to the Dutch. The combination, which afterwards gave birth to the grand alliance against France, was yet but beginning to be formed. The government of Great Britain was at this time connected with France, though the people were desirous of resisting its ambition; the emperor was too much occupied by the disturbances in Hungary, which are said to have been fomented by the emissaries of Louis; and the prince of Orange, though not too young to have acquired an influence over his own countrymen, was not yet enabled to exercise a similar influence over their allies. Even if the powers, afterwards united in the grand alliance, had been at this time sufficiently prepared for acting against France, yet so difficult is it to combine in a common cause the exertions of independent governments, that a course of discipline was still necessary for training them to a steady and effectual co-operation.

The progress of French ambition to that limit, at which it was finally repressed, exhibits a remarkable correspondence to the successive advances of imperial usurpation, which led to the treaty of Westphalia. The emperor, in the great war of thirty years, first triumphed over the resistance of the German princes, and then crushed the interposition of the king of Denmark; nor was it until the imperial power appeared to be established on the ruin of all opposition, that the confederacy was formed with France and Sweden, which adjusted the interests of the empire and of Europe. It seems in this respect to be in politics, as in mechanics. A body may with a considerable velocity find a way through the yielding atmosphere, by which we are surrounded; but the resistance is increased with the violence of the power, by which that motion is impressed, and may at length be so augmented, as to present an impenetrable barrier.

[10] This was composed of the emperor, the king of Spain, the elector of Brandenburg, and the states of the empire.—Tableau des Revol. de l'Europe, tome ii. pp. 173, 174. Denmark also acceded to it.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome ii. p. 205.

At the conclusion of the peace of Nimeguen, in the year 1678, Louis was at the summit of his grandeur. Having been successful in all his enterprises, and during the six preceding years the terror of Europe, he had then dictated to his confederated enemies the terms of pacification, enlarging his own dominions by the addition of Franche-Comtè and a moiety of Flanders. But the impulse, which had urged him thus far, continued to excite him to new aggressions, until he provoked that more powerful alliance, which fixed for a century the political relations of Europe. Not satisfied with the accessions of territory conceded to him by the treaty, he established tribunals of re-unions, for deciding on the pretensions, which he advanced in regard to other districts, as having formerly appertained to these. Spain and the empire he outraged by demands, which were not even palliated by so slight a pretext, but were urged only as agreeable to the spirit of the treaty. The Roman pontiff he treated with the most contemptuous indignity, because he had been connected with the Austrian interest. He endeavoured also to procure for one of his creatures the electorate of Cologne, and he advanced a claim of the Palatinate in behalf of his sister-in-law the duchess of Orleans.

These multiplied indications of an insatiable ambition at length produced their natural effect in the formation of the league of Augsburg, which William was thus enabled to accomplish two years before our memorable revolution. This league prepared the way for the grand alliance, which followed three years afterwards, as it favoured the revolution of the British government, which enabled William to effect that larger confederacy. By the league of Augsburg the power of France was diverted from interfering for the protection of James II. of England, and William was permitted to prosecute without obstruction the important enterprise, which, while it rescued our liberty and religion from domestic oppression, placed him in a position, by which he could secure against France the general independence of Europe.

But the formation of this important confederacy against French ambition was aided by another and more powerful principle than merely political apprehension, one which addresses itself to the hearts of individuals, and prompts them to disregard the most painful privations, and to bid defiance

to the menaces of danger. Here also we perceive a remarkable correspondence to the circumstances of the earlier adjustment of the interests of Europe, which had been effected by the German government. The motives of human policy on that occasion actuated the counsels of princes, but their subjects were instigated by an anxiety for securing religious interests, felt to be important in every gradation of society. The great division of religious sentiment, occasioned by the reformation, was not indeed in the time of Louis XIV. sufficiently recent, to act of itself with so much power on the minds of the people of Europe, as might strengthen and extend the combinations of merely political interest; but the bigotry of this monarch supplied the deficiency occasioned by the lapse of time, and kindled among his enemies a fervour of religious feeling, as in the very crisis of the reformation.

The first and most important of the measures of the royal bigotry was the revocation of the edict of Nantes, which in the year 1598, or eighty-seven years before, had constituted the Protestants an organised body in the state. If they had still continued in the situation, in which they had been placed by the edict, the measure would have been justified by the interest of the public; but all which was politically dangerous in that arrangement, had been annulled before the reign of Louis XIV., for Richelieu[11] had at length taken from them the cautionary towns, when the limited term, for which they had been conceded, had been renewed, and had again expired. That they had ceased to be objects of political apprehension, appears indeed from the testimony of Louis himself, for in his memoirs addressed to his son[12], he has enumerated all the various embarrassments, under which he assumed the direction of the government, and in this recital has made no mention of the Protestants. The animosity of their adversaries[13] however was not moderated by any consideration of their inability to cause disturbance. Though in many places a happy harmony subsisted between the two churches, yet the spirit of the *league* still prevailed among the multitude, and Louis, in recalling the edict of Nantes, and in suffering his minister to proceed even to the

[11] Eclairc. Hist., tome i. pp. 15, 16.
[12] Ibid., pp. 26—30.
[13] Ibid., tome ii. pp. 33—36.

violences of persecution, but yielded to the sentiment of the great majority of his people.

This proceeding has been ascribed to the combined influence of Louvois the minister of war[14], of Madame de Maintenon, whom the king had privately married within the two preceding months, and of the Jesuits. The minister appears to have taken upon himself the management of this part of the affairs of the government, as soon as he discovered that the interest of religion had begun to prevail in the mind of the king[15]. Madame de Maintenon, originally a Protestant, found it necessary to her advancement, that she should, as she has herself remarked, approve things very repugnant to her real sentiments. The Jesuits may well be supposed to have exercised their influence in the same cause, for the clergy had been actively employed during the sixteen preceding years in recommending this policy. The grand motive of the king appears to have been the same with that, which had prompted him to enter into his extraordinary marriage with the widow of Scarron. Disgusted with the retrospect of the licentiousness of his past life, he seems to have sought in this marriage a more reasonable and moral engagement for his private hours, and in his severe treatment of his protestant subjects the consolation of believing, that he was effacing the scandals of his former conduct by his present zeal for the cause of religion. He had indeed been persuaded, that the conversion of his protestant subjects might be effected without any actual violence[16], and was by degrees led on to the extremity, which has dishonoured his name, and more than any other cause defeated the hopes of his ambition. The revocation of the edict of Nantes, and the subsequent persecution of the French Protestants, sent abroad into the protestant countries of Europe the victims of his violence, to excite everywhere against him the most determined resistance.

Nor was this the only proceeding, by which he alarmed the apprehensions of the Protestants of Europe. His interference with the duke of Savoy, to induce him to persecute the original Protestants in the vallies of Piedmont, confirmed the persuasion of his general hostility to all, who

[14] Louis XIV., sa Cour, et le Regent, par Anquetil, tome ii. p. 172. Paris, 1793. [15] Eclairc. Hist., tome i. pp. 113, 198, 207.
[16] Siècle de Louis XIV., tome i. p. 264.

differed from the church of Rome. The devastation of the Palatinate[17] and some neighbouring districts, though only a measure of unfeeling policy, spread among the Protestants of Germany a horror of his name. His close and intimate connexion with James II. of England, who was openly endeavouring to subvert at once the religion and liberty of these countries, presented him to the view of protestant Europe as a most formidable enemy. Even among the Roman Catholic states, of which the confederacy combined against him was partly composed, he contrived to excite a religious alienation by his offensive treatment of the Roman pontiff. We seem indeed, when we are surveying the conduct of this monarch in all its bearings, to be contemplating one of the characters described to us in the fictions of romance, as lured by some supernatural agency to the pursuit of a great and splendid object, and impelled at the same time to seek it in a course of action, which frustrates the aspirings of their irregular ambition.

The Protestant of Ireland, when he reviews the reign of Louis, may derive a melancholy consolation from observing, that the penal code, which disgraced the Irish history through the greater part of the last century, had a more than adequate precedent in the government of the boasted monarch of the French. Children were admitted at the age of seven years to become independent of their parents by abjuring their religion[18]; and military execution was employed to enforce a conformity to the religion of the state[19], while the miserable resource of a voluntary exile was prohibited.

It is a very curious fact, that the preservation of the religion of Protestants in these circumstances was the result of an outrageous declaration of the succeeding sovereign, which rendered their marriages void[20]. The Roman Catholics of France, regarding the ceremony of marriage as one of the sacraments of their church, were obliged by their principles to refuse it to the Protestants, as heretics, who accordingly were by this decree placed in a singular state of proscription

[17] These ravages comprehended all the Palatinate, a part of the electorate of Treves, a part of the margravate of Baden, and the greater part of the countries adjacent to the Rhine.—Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. p. 232. [18] Eclaire. Hist., tome i. p. 187. [19] Ibid. p. 206. [20] Ibid., tome ii. pp. 36, &c.

from all the legal obligations of domestic connexion. Revolting at the violence thus offered to their best feelings, the Protestants from that time rejected the semblance of proselytism, under which they had sought concealment, and maintained their own sect, with its discipline, its ministries, and its registries, to the time of the revolution.

It is remarkable that the church of France, which waged against Protestants this war of persecution, had been three years before established in a considerable degree of independence in regard to the papacy, by the system of regulations ascertaining its liberties. The ambition of the Roman pontiffs having been more particularly directed against the empire, as it claimed the sovereignty of Rome, France had been generally treated with much forbearance, that it might afford support to the pontiffs in that their principal struggle. Boniface VIII. had indeed attempted to extend over France the papal claim of dominion; but Philip the Fair, assembling the states general of his kingdom in the years 1302 and 1303, maintained by their assistance the independence of his crown. Among the subjects of contention with the court of Rome was the right named the *regale*[21], by which the king received the revenues of the vacant prelacies, and collated during the vacancies to the benefices comprehended within their patronage. In the reign of Louis XIV. two bishops[22], claiming to be exempt from its application, invoked the protection of pope Innocent XI., who accordingly addressed to the king very strenuous representations in their favour. Irritated at this interference, the king in the year 1682 convened an assembly of the clergy, which, besides confirming the universal application of the disputed right, established the four famous principles of the liberties of the Gallican church. By these it was pronounced, that the pope possesses no temporal authority over the church, that his spiritual authority is subordinate to that of a general council, that his authority is also limited by the canons, customs, and constitutions of the kingdom and church of France, and that in matters of faith his judgment is not infallible.

Richelieu, who first reduced the power of the French Pro-

[21] The German emperors Otho IV. and Frederic II. had renounced the *regale* in the years 1209 and 1213.—Tableau des Revol. de l'Europe, tome i. p. 327, note. [22] Ibid., tome ii. pp. 181, 182.

testants, is said to have meditated to create a patriarch in France[23], and thus to separate the national church from that of Rome, flattering himself with the hope of effecting a compromise of doctrine with the Protestants. Louis XIV. on the other hand, without any disposition, either to attempt such a compromise, or to withdraw formally from the authority of the church of Rome[24], asserted for his own church a real independence of the control of the papacy. It seems as if, though religious dissension was still important in its influence on political movements, yet in the French period of the federative combinations of Europe the system was so far improved, as neither to require, nor to admit, the direct ascendency of Rome. It may now also be concluded, that the independence then established was preparatory to later changes, by which the national church of France has been recently overthrown, and the way seems to have been opened in that country for the free propagation of a purer form of the religion of Christ.

The edict of Nantes was revoked in the year 1685, and in the succeeding year was concluded the league of Augsburg, which united against France the emperor, the king of Spain, the Dutch republic, Sweden, Savoy, and the principal states of the empire. This combination was formed by the prince of Orange, then meditating his enterprise against the government of England. With the success of that enterprise it was intimately connected, for on the one hand it

[23] Eclairc. Hist., tome i. p. 81. [24] If any such disposition did exist, it was in the year 1713 suppressed by the influence, which the Jesuits then exercised over this prince, enfeebled by age and disappointment. At the desire of Louis, the Roman pontiff Clement II. issued the bull *Unigenitus*, to condemn a French translation of the New Testament, published by Paschasius Quenel, which favoured the tenets of the Jansenists; and this bull established the peculiar doctrines and practices of the religion of Rome with so much distinctness, that all modifications were rendered hopeless.—Mosheim, vol. vi. pp. 13—15. This bull was not indeed received in France without much opposition, whence arose a correspondence between doctor du Pin and archbishop Wake concerning a union of the English and Gallican churches, but without any other consequence than as it may serve to prove, how illusory such a project should be deemed. Doctor Kenney has well shown, that Bossuet, who endeavoured so to palliate the peculiar doctrines of Rome, as to render them acceptable to Protestants, was at the same time the justifier and panegyrist of the savage persecution of the Protestants of France.—Facts and Documents, &c. London, 1827.

united in its favour those very states, which might otherwise for religious considerations have been adverse to the success of that prince, and on the other it directed against the empire that attention, which France should have employed in watching and counteracting his designs. The minister of the marine had urged the king to prepare for this purpose two considerable armaments[25], one by sea, the other by land. Fortunately however for the religion and liberty of these countries, and for the general policy of Europe, the advice of the minister of war prevailed. About two months before the Dutch expedition a French army of eighty thousand men was accordingly sent against the empire under the command of the dauphin, and William was most surprisingly left to prosecute without any molestation an enterprise, which would enable him effectually to control, by a yet more powerful combination of forces, the ambition of his great adversary. It was supposed that the Dutch would not send away their fleet, when a war had broken out in their vicinity; and perhaps it was judged expedient to make a diversion in favour of the Turks, then engaged in a war with the empire.

The grand alliance, concerted against France in the year 1689, was a direct result of that enterprise, which placed William on the throne of these countries. William was the soul of the resistance opposed to French ambition, and by the success of his expedition he was enabled to bring these countries into a confederacy against France with the emperor, the empire, the Dutch republic, Spain, and Savoy. By the formation of this confederacy the second period of the federative policy of Europe was commenced. France had by the two preceding wars been placed in the situation of the predominating power of the system, but the British government was then for the first time constituted the leading power of the confederacy, by which that predominating power was to be controlled. The British revolution, as it committed these countries in a struggle with France, the attached auxiliary of James II., and at the same time engaged them in a temporary connexion of political interests with the Dutch republic, the adversary of the French power, was accordingly the immediate occasion of a new arrangement of

[25] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. pp. 230, 231.

policy, in which the British government became the antagonist of the great power of the continent.

CHAPTER XXI.

Of the history of colonisation and commerce, from the commencement of the sixteenth century to the British revolution.

The American slave-trade begun in the year 1503—Mexico conquered, 1521—Peru conquered, 1533—Canada settled, 1603—Virginia settled, 1606—Barbadoes settled, 1614—New England settled, 1620—Emigration of the Puritans, 1621—Portuguese dominion in India begun, 1507—The Mogul empire begun, 1526—The Dutch trade begun, 1595—The English company formed, 1600—The Dutch company, 1602—The Dutch settlements begun, 1605—The English factory formed at Surat, 1611—The French trade begun, 1665.

THE fifteenth century closed with two most important discoveries, that of a western continent, and that of a maritime communication with India. The former of these brought within the knowledge of Europeans a considerable portion of the world, the very existence of which had been until that time unknown; and the latter introduced them by a much more practicable route to that opulent region, which had been from the earliest ages the grand source of commercial prosperity. It is now necessary to trace the formation of colonial establishments in these countries through the two succeeding centuries, and the great extension of commerce, to which they were instrumental, the power supplied by commerce having mainly influenced the policy of Europe in its later period.

The two great discoveries of the fifteenth century were as much contrasted in the political circumstances, as in the geographical positions, of the countries, to which they related, and thus afforded a most various field for that spirit of adventure, which was to bring into those countries the industry and activity of Europe. The western continent, which by its proximity was more conveniently situated for the migrations necessary for forming great colonial estab-

lishments, was peopled by tribes so far inferior to the Europeans in the arts of life, as to present only a resistance, which might preserve their civilisation from wasting itself by spreading into a boundless extent. India on the other hand was possessed by nations civilised and even refined, and invited commercial activity, rather than colonisation. The earlier establishments of Europeans in India were accordingly mere factories, and their more extended possessions were slowly acquired by conquest or intrigue, not suddenly wrested from a feeble resistance, or simply occupied by an overflowing emigration. The two discoveries however conjointly formed a combination most favourable to the developement of European industry and activity. The long established opulence of the east afforded an immediate excitement to maritime enterprise; the wild regions of the western continent opened an indefinite field for the exertions of a succeeding period. America also in the mean time furnished that augmented supply of the precious metals, without which the commerce of India could not have been extended, this being the merchandise chiefly demanded by the people of the east. The acquisition of the precious metals was indeed the object, which originally drew the views of men even towards northern America, and it was long before the importance of colonisation, in distinction from this object, began to be appreciated.

It is remarkable that the two great discoveries of the east and west were effected, and the first great establishments formed in those distant regions, by nations which have never become considerable in the commerce of Europe. Spain, the discoverer of the western world, sunk very soon afterwards into a state of imbecility, from which it has never since been restored; and Portugal, after a short, but splendid career, of eastern enterprise, yielded to the ascendency of the Dutch, and became degraded to a state of inefficiency even inferior to that of the other kingdom of the peninsula.

It has been commonly maintained, that the possession of the mines of America must necessarily have been ruinous to the industry of the nations, by which they had been acquired. This has been latterly shown to be an error[1], the

[1] Brougham's Inquiry into the Colonial Policy of the European Powers, vol. i. p. 449.

mischievous influence of such possessions appearing to arise from injudicious attempts to prohibit the exportation of the precious metals, and to monopolise treasures merely representative. But so long as it was agreeable to our nature, that such possessions should give occasion to these erroneous measures of restriction, the trade must have been inconsistent with commercial prosperity, and would have been fatal to the well-being of nations even more favourably circumstanced in other respects than those of Spain and Portugal. The erroneous conception of the advantage to be derived from possessing mines of the precious metals, was indeed in that age the great spring of the discovery and colonisation of distant countries. So obstinate was this prejudice, that more than a century after the discovery of Columbus[2], the English settlement of Virginia was considerably embarrassed by the delusive notion of mines of gold, by which the minds of the adventurers were engrossed. According then to the actual dispositions of the human heart it was conducive to the general improvement of the system, that the mines of America should be possessed by nations, which other causes disqualified for becoming considerable in commerce.

It has been remarked[3], that Providence appears to have cast the parts of the several nations of Europe, which have acted upon the stage of America. The Spaniard, proud, lazy, and magnificent, is possessed of an extensive region, in which he enjoys a luxurious climate, and is enriched by a profusion of those metals, which may procure for him every indulgence without any laborious effort: the Portuguese, indigent at home, and enterprising rather than industrious abroad, possesses treasures like the Spaniard, but employs them to more useful purposes: the English, attentive to business, and yet fond of a rural life, occupied a wide tract of country, which furnishes neither gold nor silver, but affords ample room for the exercise of agriculture, and supplies in sufficient abundance the materials of commerce: the French, active, enterprising, and politic, had a country, in which a peddling traffic required a constant motion, and in the islands had an opportunity of displaying all the effi-

[2] Anderson, vol. ii. pp. 213, 304. [3] Account of the European Settlements in America, vol. ii. pp. 57, 58. Lond., 1777.

cacy of their policy; and the Dutch had just room enough to manifest the miracles of frugality and diligence.

To these remarks others may be added concerning the distribution of southern America between the two nations of the Spanish peninsula, by which the Portuguese became possessed of the nearer, the Spaniards of the more distant portion. The first efforts of maritime discovery, exerted by the Portuguese, were directed along the coast of Africa, in search of that communication with India, of which the Cape of Good Hope at length presented a joyful assurance. In the prosecution of this great enterprise the coast of Africa was occupied by their settlements, so that, when Brazil[4] was afterwards accidentally discovered, they enjoyed advantages, beyond those of any other nation, for supplying with slaves the labours of the colony there established, while Brazil was by its proximity most conveniently situated for receiving the importation. To this consideration should be added that of the superior activity of the Portuguese, which qualified them beyond the Spaniards, for improving the natural resources of a country so favourably placed for a commercial connexion with Europe. The extraordinary changes of later years have pointed out yet another, and a more important influence, of the connexion of Portugal with the nearer coast of southern America, in facilitating the temporary removal of the court of Portugal to that country, when it had become necessary that the British power should occupy its place for the deliverance of the peninsula, and subsequently the permanent establishment of a European sovereignty on the further side of the Atlantic.

The peculiar fitness of the Portuguese for the part, which they have acted in forming colonial establishments, is however more conspicuous in their eastern enterprises. India was not, like America, almost open to the occupancy of the first European settlers. There was to be encountered all the opposition, which could be presented by the Mohammedans, already possessed of the rich commerce of India,

[4] Account of the European settlements, vol. i. pp. 308, 310. Their trade in slaves seems to have been begun so early as in the year 1503, when a few slaves were sent from the Portuguese settlements in Africa into the Spanish colonies in America.—Robertson's Hist. of America, vol. i. p. 318.

and established in its stations of trade. Even a christian power was combined with the Mohammedans in resisting the Portuguese, the Venetians having, for the preservation of their interest in the existing traffic, entered into the measures of the sultan of Egypt, and permitted him to cut down timber in their forests of Dalmatia, his own country not supplying materials for equipping a fleet in the Red Sea. Obstacles so considerable could be surmounted only by a power, which had been trained to military, rather than to commercial habits. In the conduct of the Portuguese accordingly the military character predominated. No company of merchants was formed for regulating the concerns of the commerce of India, but these were directed by the military officers of the government, and soon became the object of their unbridled rapacity. The Portuguese were qualified to be the precursors of trading nations, by breaking down the power, which had pre-occupied the commerce of India, not to become themselves commercial agents, for maintaining the communication of its advantages to Europe.

The manner, in which the oriental possessions of Portugal were afterwards transferred to the Dutch, is in this view particularly curious. If they were to be forcibly wrested from a military nation, they must have fallen to a nation yet more military, and consequently so much less qualified for the occupations of commerce. Some peculiar circumstances therefore were required, for transferring them with little effort to a nation of traders. These were furnished by the reduction of Portugal itself under the dominion of Spain, which occurred seventy-three years after the commencement of the Portuguese dominion in India[5]. The success, with which Philip II. grasped the entire command of the Spanish peninsula, served but to expose without protection the remoter dependencies of the conquered territory, and thus to aggrandise his revolted subjects of the Dutch provinces.

As the military enterprise of the Portuguese was exercised in acquiring establishments in India, so was that of the Spaniards in overcoming the American empires of Mexico and Peru[6], for the original inhabitants of those countries were

[5] Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. ii. p. 100. [6] Mexico was conquered by Cortes in the year 1521, Peru twelve years afterwards by Pizarro. In the former the right of private property was well esta-

not wandering savages living by the chace, but nations comparatively civilised, and even in some small degree acquainted with the arts. In these circumstances [7] the patient fortitude of the Spaniards was not less indispensable to a successful issue, than the ardent daring of the Portuguese was necessary for effecting a revolution in the commercial intercourse with India.

In comparing the original circumstances of the Spanish territories in America with those colonised by the English, it occurs to remark, that the difference is not destitute of a discoverable correspondence in their subsequent fortunes.

blished, there were many cities of considerable magnitude, the arts were separately practised by several persons, a distinction of ranks was minutely and ceremoniously observed, and a vigorous superintendence was exercised under the authority of a sovereign, supported by a regulated system of taxation. Peru contained only one city, and consequently the separation of the arts was less complete, and the intercourse of commerce less active; agriculture however was more improved than in Mexico, and superior ingenuity was displayed in buildings, in communications by roads and bridges, and in ornamental arts.—Robertson, vol. iii. pp. 271, &c. Of the tribes, which founded the government of Mexico, the Toultees appeared first in the year 648, the Chichimecks in the year 1179, the Nahnaltees in the year 1178, the Acolhues and Aztecs in the year 1196. From materials furnished by Humboldt Laplace collected, that the duration of the solar year, as computed by these nations, was very nearly the same with that found by the astronomers of Almamon. The traveller supposes that other tribes existed in Mexico before the arrival of the Toultees; but these he traces for their origin to Siberia. The migration from Asia, he has shown, might have been effected without going higher than the parallel of thirty-five degrees, and without a passage of more than twenty-four or thirty-six hours, the northwest winds, between the latitudes of thirty and sixty degrees, favouring such a navigation during a great part of the year. The area of the kingdom of Mexico under Montezuma, its last sovereign, he has estimated at 15,000 square leagues. The present territory of Mexico is five times larger than that of Spain.—Polit. Essay on the kingdom of New Spain, vol. i. pp. 11, 13, 133, 135; vol. ii. p. 389, note. Peru, at the time of the Spanish invasion, extended more than fifteen hundred miles along the shore of the Pacific Ocean, but in breadth was limited to the space included between that ocean and the Andes. When the Spaniards arrived, four hundred years according to tradition from the commencement of the government, but probably at little more than half of that interval, the prince, who by the conquest of Quito had almost doubled the power of the empire, had, by dividing his dominions between two sons, given occasion to a civil war, which favoured the efforts of Pizarro.—Robertson, vol. iii. pp. 126—133, 326.

[7] Account of the European Settlements, vol. i. p. 67.

The Spaniards have occupied, rather than enjoyed, a most extensive range of territory[8], and amidst all the embarrassment of domestic decay, have held it as it were in deposit for the accommodation of the other nations of Europe. Such a possession was evidently facilitated by the remaining habits of political co-operation, which survived the destruction of the empires of Guatimozin and Atahualpa. Great indeed was the waste of the native population; but it has since been successfully cherished by the Spanish government[9], has formed to the present time a part of the same community with the Spaniards[10], and has been preserved as a counterpoise to the otherwise dangerous power of the negroes[11]. The other settlements of Europeans, less remote from their original countries, and belonging to governments more capable of affording them support, or important only as containing the germs of future industry and independence, have been left to acquire consistency and vigour for themselves, with little mixture of a race so far inferior in civilisation. The wild hunters of the woods however were useful, though in a very different manner, to the formation of these other settlements. They hung upon the colonists in their

[8] It comprehends seventy-nine degrees of latitude, extending from 41° 43′ of south to 37° 48′ of north latitude, equalling the length of Africa, and much surpassing the breadth of the Russian empire. The dominions of the king of Spain in America accordingly exceeded in extent the Russian empire, or the Indian empire of Great Britain.—Polit. Essay on the Kingdom of New Spain, vol. i. pp. 5—7. [9] It is certain, says Humboldt, that the population of New Spain has made the most extraordinary progress, and among the proofs he alleges the increased amount of the Indian capitation.—Ibid., p. 99. 'In no code of laws,' says Robertson, vol. iv. p. 43, 'is greater solicitude displayed, or precautions multiplied with more prudent concern, for the preservation, the security, and the happiness of the subject, than we discover in the collection of the Spanish laws for the Indies.' These regulations indeed, he admits, have been often ineffectual, especially in Peru; but the oppression, he adds, is not general, and many of the Indians enjoy ease, and even affluence. [10] From the year 1542, in which Charles V. issued his regulations, the Indians have been reputed freemen, and entitled to the privileges of subjects.—Ibid., p. 37. They were indeed required to pay a capitation tax, averaging among the several provinces at nearly four shillings, and to perform certain services, for which however they received an equitable recompense. [11] Account of the European settlements, vol. i. p 257. The Indians and the negroes, it is also there stated, are forbidden under the severest penalties to marry, or have any unlawful commerce.

progress into the forest, and by the dread of the tomahawk and the scalping knife prevented a dispersion, which would else have retarded and enfeebled their political combination.

It was soon discovered by the Spaniards, that the feeble natives of their new settlements were not adequate to the labours required of them. As the Portuguese had already availed themselves of their establishments on the coast of Africa, to begin a traffic in the persons of their fellow-men, it occurred, not only to the avarice of the Spanish settlers, but also to the inconsistent humanity of Las Casas, the advocate of the oppressed Americans, to substitute in the toils of their settlements the negroes of Africa for the aborigines of the western continent. The circumstances of the original country of the negroes appear to have qualified them[12], beyond all other human beings, for enduring the severity of labour and the malignity of climate. It may therefore be maintained, though without any disposition to justify, or even to palliate, this abominable traffic, that advantage has been derived from it to the improvement of Europe, and consequently to the general improvement of the world, if the extension of commerce was facilitated by the supply of labour thus procured for the mines and plantations of America.

On Africa the slave-trade of the western states of Europe has unquestionably exercised a deteriorating influence, for the robbery of men, which it has instigated, must have thrown that country yet further back in civilisation, than it had been already placed by its natural disadvantages. The Atlantic slave-trade however, though its victims are subjected to much severer sufferings than the other slaves of Africa, is but a small part of the traffic in men[13], which

[12] Brougham's Inquiry into the Colonial Policy, vol. ii. p. 449.

[13] The Atlantic slave-trade, we have been informed by Burckhardt, is trifling in comparison with the slavery prevailing in the interior of Africa, the Mohammedan nations of that country being prompted by their religion to make war upon the idolatrous negroes, requiring for their accommodation a constant supply of servants and shepherds, and considering slaves as a medium of exchange in the place of money. There is moreover an annual exportation of fifteen or twenty thousand slaves from the eastern side of Africa to Egypt and Arabia.—Travels in Nubia, pp. 344, 442. Lond., 1819. Slavery however in the east, this writer remarks, has little dreadful in it except the name, though females indeed suffered much from the jealousy of their mistresses.—Ibid., p. 341.

prevails in that unhappy country; and it seems as if the country were naturally so circumstanced, that it could never emerge from its barbarity by any internal efforts, but must continue for ever to supply other regions with its enslaved population, unless it should be assisted by the re-action of that improvement, which it had thus aided to create. For satisfying in this respect the feelings of our humanity, we must accordingly look either to that influence of an extended commerce, which may introduce industry into the interior of the country, or perhaps rather to some future communication with the negroes of the West-Indies, or their descendants, when these shall have attained to improvement moral and political.

The American settlements of France and England, as they were later in their origin than those of the Spaniards and the Portuguese, so were they altogether different in regard to the spirit, in which they were formed. They were not the result of magnificent enterprises[14], prompted by a romantic ambition combined with an insatiable thirst for gold, but were speculations in industry and independence. These also differed among themselves in regard to the circumstances, in which they had originated, and the spirit with which they were respectively conducted. The French settlements were formed under the direction of a systematic policy, guiding the efforts of an active industry; the English were the work of liberty, actuating the natural character of the people. It has indeed been remarked by Volney[15], that his countrymen are not well qualified by national character and habit for the business of colonising in a wild and unsettled country, being incapable of the phlegmatic perseverance, which such an enterprise requires, and impatient

[14] Account of the European Settlements, vol. ii. p. 60.

[15] View of the Climate and Soil of the United States of America, pp. 382. &c. Lond., 1804. This writer has accordingly observed, that of fourteen or fifteen instances of French farmers, whom he had heard mentioned, only two or three had any prospect of success; that all the villages heretofore formed on the frontiers of Canada or Louisiana, and left to their own resources, had failed; and that visiting and talking are from habit so essential to a Frenchman, that throughout the whole frontier of these countries there is not one settler of that nation to be found, whose house is not within reach, or within sight, of some other.—Ibid., pp. 365, 366, 386.

of that separation from social intercourse, which must be the condition of original planters. It will accordingly appear, that France has been engaged in schemes of colonisation only so far, as might bring her interests into collision with those of Great Britain, her great adversary in the struggle of nations.

This collision occurred in the very first effort of the French to establish themselves in the West-Indies, for they and the English took possession of different parts of the same island[16], that of Saint Christopher. In North America again a very curious and remarkable relation existed between the settlements of the two nations. While the English settlers occupied all that range of country, which extends from the gulf of Saint Lawrence to the Floridas, the French, after an unsuccessful attempt to establish themselves in Carolina, formed a settlement in Canada; and at a subsequent period[17] they took possession of Louisiana, in the intention of opening, by the Mississippi and its tributary rivers, an interior communication with their northern colony. The English settlements were thus inclosed within a circumvallation of the same people, to which the mother-country was opposed in Europe. They were thereby compelled to a closer combination, than the dread of the wandering natives was capable of effecting, and they were at the same time taught to cling to the mother country for that protection, which in these circumstances was necessary for their security.

Virginia, so named by Raleigh from the celibacy of his sovereign, was the first scene of the continental colonisation of the English; but the states of New England, which were peopled by their religious dissension, most fully exhibited the enterprising vigour of the national character. Fleeing from a restraint, which was repugnant to the independence of their principles, both of religion and policy, the Puritans of England sought in the forests of America an asylum, in which they might enjoy their favourite opinions without molestation, and carried with them the germs of that liberty, which a hundred and sixty-three years afterwards established an independent republic in the western continent, the com-

[16] Edwards's Hist. of the West-Indies, vol. i. p. 454. Lond., 1807.
[17] In the year 1698.

mencement of new combinations of states, and of new systems of policy.

The Puritans of New England soon forgot to allow to others that religious liberty, which they had so loudly claimed for themselves. The early history of that state is a history of the most gloomy and intolerant fanaticism, nor did the baleful influence of this malignant spirit begin to be moderated[18], until its violence had been exhausted in a series of iniquitous persecutions for the imaginary crime of witchcraft, of the absurdity and wickedness of which the people at length became ashamed. But this spirit, absurd and criminal as it was, had its utility in assisting the work of colonisation. As the persecution[19], which they had experienced at home, drove the first settlers to seek a retreat in New England, so did the intolerant violence of the colonists themselves drive away from the original stock several parties of settlers, who had joined in the emigration, though they did not precisely agree with the genuine Puritans in their notions of religion.

Happily for our establishments[20], the bigotry of the French government would not suffer it to perceive the advantage of affording to the Protestants of France a refuge in America. If the religious fervour and commercial industry of the Huguenots had been indulged with the same opportunity of independence and exertion, which was enjoyed by the Puritans of England, the English colonies must have been so pressed by the rival settlements of France, that they could not have attained to the prosperity, which soon rendered them considerable. Instead however of adopting this liberal policy, the French government drove its protestant subjects into other countries of Europe, into which they introduced their own habits of manufacturing industry.

The struggle between the French and the English was, in the eighteenth century, not less strenuous in the eastern, than in the western world. But in the period of time comprehended within the present chapter, the great struggle of the English was with the Dutch, who had succeeded the Portuguese in almost all their oriental establishments. The United Provinces began in the year 1595 a commercial in-

[18] Account of the European Settlements, vol. ii. pp. 155, &c.
[19] Ibid., pp. 146, &c. [20] Ibid., p. 236.

tercourse with India, when they had been excluded by Philip II. from the port of Lisbon, from which they had previously conveyed the produce of the east to the other markets of Europe; and the rivalry of the two nations soon gave occasion to mutual hostilities, the result of which was that the Dutch speedily became possessed of the Spice Islands, and formed a settlement in Ceylon. The English, less dependent on commerce than the Dutch, were less forward to engage in this distant traffic. Seven years[21] accordingly had passed from the time of the first voyage of the Dutch, when the circumnavigations of Drake and Cavendish excited the English merchants to send out their first fleet, that they also might procure for themselves the rich and gratifying merchandise of India. This delay[22], small as it was, had allowed to the Dutch sufficient time for becoming masters of the Spice Islands. The English were thereby compelled to seek continental, rather than insular settlements, and, notwithstanding the resistance of the Portuguese, the first English factory was, with the consent of the Mogul governor, established in the year 1611 at Surat in the province of Cambay. The struggle of the two nations terminated, after an obstinate contest, in leaving the islands of India for the most part to the Dutch[23], and the continental settlements to the English.

The French were at length in the year 1665 excited by the success of other nations to engage in the profitable commerce of India: but following the Dutch and the English at the distance of more than half a century, they found the stations and connexions of trade in a great degree pre-occupied. Their establishments accordingly were neither extensive, nor permanent. After a transient prosperity, derived from the zealous patronage of their minister Colbert, they were by a rapid declension of their affairs reduced almost to the possession of Pondicherry, the future rival of the English settlement at Madras.

The transition of the trade of India from the Portuguese to the Dutch and the English, gave occasion to an important change in the manner, in which it was conducted. By the Portuguese this trade was managed as the business of the

[21] Maurice's Modern History of Hindostan, vol. ii. p. 262. London, 1809. [22] Ibid., p. 265. [23] Ibid., p. 277.

government, not of the merchants; and it accordingly declined, as the fervour of that spirit of military enterprise abated, by which it was supported. The efforts of the Dutch and English on the other hand, being made by merchants, were of a commercial, not of a military character. It was accordingly soon judged necessary to give them the combination, which could belong only to a chartered incorporation. As in England the unity of a monarchical government was combined with a spirit of mercantile enterprise, the plan of an incorporation of the merchants trading with India was, in the year 1600, there first adopted[24]; but at the close of two years more the Dutch imitated the example by establishing a company for their own traders. Of these the English company, which has created in the east a subordinate empire of vast extent and population, has exhibited to the world the extraordinary spectacle of a society of merchants managing imperial concerns at the distance of the half of the globe. That it has been efficient to the creation of that empire has been proved by experience; and the absorption of so much means of influence, as would have been furnished to the crown by the possession of so great patronage civil and military, cannot but have been salutary to the independence of the constitution.

To all these changes the native history of Hindostan has been in a very remarkable manner auxiliary. Exactly a century before the appearance of the Portuguese, the irruption of Timour, or Tamerlane, had shaken to its centre the Mohammedan empire of Delhi, though it failed to establish a Tatarian dominion. All India, within the half of a cen-

[24] The Whigs in the year 1698 availed themselves of their superiority to increase their influence by establishing a new company.—Somerville, p. 623. On this occasion the opposition of the former was defeated by a ridiculous occurrence, many of their friends having gone to see a tiger baited, for the majority exceeded the other party by only ten votes.—Evelyn's Memoirs, vol. ii. p. 62. London, 1818. The two companies were incorporated into one in the year 1701. That the English company has so efficiently administered the affairs of India has been attributed to its separation from the influence of the parties of the parliament, whereas the colonies of the Dutch were sacrificed to the cupidity and sordid feelings of a democracy.—Blackwood's Edinb. Mag. May, 1833. The imperial character of the English company seems to have been created by the charter granted by Charles II. in the year 1661.

tury from that invasion[25], was accordingly divided into independent states, only a small district about Delhi remaining to the nominal sovereign. Such a state of affairs was evidently favourable to the enterprises of the Portuguese, as the Mohammedans were not united in the combination of a common government, and some of the native princes were left at liberty to connect themselves with the traders of Europe. The favourable disposition of affairs in India, which had been thus begun so long before the arrival of the Portuguese, was completed within twenty-eight years after that event, by the commencement of the Mogul dynasty of sovereigns of India[26], which willingly entered into commercial relations with the Europeans, not being, like the preceding, connected with their rivals of the Mediterranean. In that interval the Portuguese had successfully availed themselves of the favourable disposition of the native princes[27], to procure for themselves an establishment so secure, that they were enabled to acquire possession of the commercial stations of the Mohammedans. The renown of the Portuguese at length reached the imperial court, in the reign of the illustrious Akber, the third of the Mogul sovereigns; and this prince, while he reduced to subjection the rajahs of India[28], encouraged by his powerful protection the merchants of Portugal[29].

The Mogul empire of India began to decline at the death of Aurungzeb, which happened in the year 1707. This vigorous sovereign, with a crusading spirit unknown to his predecessors, attacked the religion, not less than the independence of the native princes of India. He succeeded in reducing the once powerful kingdoms of Visapore and Golconda[30], but in his struggle with the rising power of the Mahrattas he exhausted the resources of his own government, and prepared it for the ruinous influence of the dissension and the weakness of his successors. The decline of the Mogul empire was however not less favourable to European

[25] Maurice, vol. ii. p. 66. [26] It is remarkable that this revolution was the result of the degeneracy and decay of the original sovereignty of the Moguls in Tatary itself. The Moguls, forced to yield to the ascendency of the Usbeck Tatars, sought in India a refuge from their conquerors.—Ibid. [27] Ibid., p. 232. [28] Ibid., pp. 172, 174. [29] Ibid., p. 187. [30] Sullivan's Analysis of the Polit. Hist. of India, p. 175, note. London, 1784. Maurice, vol. ii. pp. 492, &c.

enterprise, than its establishment. The field was left more open for the efforts of the French and English, and an opportunity was presented for the gradual formation of a European sovereignty in Hindostan.

From this retrospect it appears that, at the time of the British revolution, Spain and Portugal had completed those American settlements, which had a permanent, though a circuitous connexion, with the great interests of commerce; that in the east the acquisitions of Portugal had been transferred to the Dutch, whose habits of mercantile dealing enabled them to derive the advantage, which these settlements were fitted to bestow; and that the settlements of the French and English were then merely incipient, and to receive their strength and importance in the succeeding century, when the governments, to which they respectively belonged, should have been engaged in the struggle of the federative policy of Europe, the former contending for pre-eminence, the latter for independence.

CHAPTER XXII.

Of the histories of Turkey and Persia, from the accession of Solyman I. to the throne of Turkey in the year 1520 *to the peace of Constantinople concluded in the year* 1700.

Alliance concluded with France by Turkey in the year 1536—Battle of Lepanto fought, 1571—The chief aggrandisement of Persia from 1585 to 1627—Persia ceased to maintain an equal struggle with Turkey, 1637—Turkish war of Candia from 1645 to 1669—Vienna besieged by the Turks and relieved by the Poles, 1683—Peace of Carlowitz concluded by the Turks, 1699—Peace of Constantinople, 1700.

THE history of these two governments has been already reviewed to the time, when Solyman I. became the sovereign of the former, and with Charles V. of Germany, Francis I. of France, Henry VIII. of these countries, and the Roman pontiff Leo X., composed that assemblage of illustrious contemporaries noticed by Robertson, to which the historian might have added Ismail, the founder of the modern king-

dom of Persia, if that kingdom had been comprehended within his view of history. The consideration of the two Mohammedan governments[1] is now to be continued to the conclusion of the seventeenth century, at which time both ceased to exercise any active influence on the interests of the Christian states, and Persia was governed by the last of the sophis, the dynasty founded by Ismail.

The general operation of the government of Turkey on the formation of the European system has been described, as consisting in that agency of compression, which seems to be a powerful principle of our social improvement; and that of Persia in so controlling and regulating the action of Turkey, that it should not press too violently, or at unseasonable times, on those combinations of policy, to the adjustment of which it was thus indirectly instrumental. A double apparatus appears to have been in this manner at the fitting season annexed to modern Europe, which by a very curious mechanism, if the term may be applied to the combinations of voluntary and free agents, has increased, or relaxed, the intensity of its operation, in such manner as might best correspond to the movements of the system, on which it operated. As the system of Europe was internally balanced by religious opposition, so was this exterior balance constituted in a similar manner. The religion of Mohammed divided itself into two sects irreconcilably opposed, and the dissension of the followers of Omar and of Ali supported the struggle of the two Mohammedan governments of Turkey and Persia.

In this combination of the two Mohammedan governments two remarkable distinctions may be observed. The Persian government was not, like that of Turkey[2], adverse to re-

[1] European Turkey comprehends 182,560 square miles, inhabited by eight millions; Asiatic Turkey 470,400, inhabited by ten millions of people; so that the whole territory of Turkey includes 652,960 square miles, and the entire population amounts to eighteen millions. The area of Persia may be estimated to exceed that of the whole Turkish empire, the country extending from east to west more than 1200, from south to north about 1000 miles; the population however probably exceeds but little that of Asiatic Turkey.—Pinkerton's Mod. Geogr., vol. i. p. 452; vol. ii. pp. 18, 320, 325. [2] Even however in the history of the Turks we discover some traces of attention given to music and poetry. It is recorded of Amurath IV. that to a musician, found among a multitude of captives taken at the reduction of Bagdad in the

finement, for poetry appears to have been constantly cherished by the Persians even to the present time. From this people the Arabs in their progress of conquest acquired their taste for the refinement of literature; and, though from the beginning of the fifteenth century the literary distinction of Persia must be considered as obscured, yet the people are still devotedly fond of poetry[3], and the meanest artisan can even now recite passages of the eminent bards of his country, the rudest soldier will leave his tent to listen to the strain of the minstrel. The distractions of an arbitrary, and therefore unsettled government, have interrupted the succession of genius; but the national love of poetry received notwithstanding some encouragement from the spirit of the dynasty of the sophis, for the doctrine of *sooffeeism*[4], which they introduced into the religion of Mohammed, was a mysticism essentially poetical, and has accordingly been happily described by the modern historian of Persia[5] to be 'the belief of the imagination.' The other distinction of the two governments was, that the power of the Persian sovereign was not controlled even by a restraint so imperfect,

year 1637, he granted not only his own life, but also the lives of all who had not been massacred; and this musician is represented as having introduced into Turkey his Persian music. The instrument, which he used, is described as a psaltery or sort of harp, having six strings on each side, whence it was named *scheschdar*.—Cantimir, tome iii. pp. 102, 103. Amurath was not indeed a very rigid Turk, for he indulged himself to excess in drinking.—Ibid., p. 90. In the reign of Mustapha II., which began in the year 1695, we find mention of an academy of poetry established at Constantinople.—Ibid., tome iv. p. 383. The neglect of architecture is ascribed to a contempt of every mechanic art.—Ibid., tome iii. p. 446. [3] Sir J. Malcolm's Hist. of Persia, vol. ii. pp. 398, 539. [4] This mystic doctrine, which was probably derived from India, inculcated the duty of seeking communion with the Deity, in the hope of being finally re-absorbed into his essence, of which it teaches that the soul of man is a part; and it maintains the possibility of attaining even in this life to a state of celestial beatitude through a superior piety. It appears from Mohammedan authors, that this enthusiasm has been coeval with their religion, the establishment of which it may have much assisted. The sooffees have however since been considered as its most dangerous enemies, and their number has latterly increased so much in Persia, that the Mohammedan divines have called on the reigning king to defend the true faith from their attacks, and measures of severity have been accordingly employed with apparent success, though probably in reality with a contrary influence. Ibid., pp. 382—388. [5] Ibid., p. 387.

as that which limited the sovereignty of the Turks. In that country no *oulamâh*[6], or body of the church and law, existed; and it would be considered as treason to affirm, that the sovereign was subject to any restraint, except such as might be imposed by his own conscience or discretion. One cause of this difference appears to have been that, in supporting the pretensions of Ali to the caliphate, the Persians have been led to disregard the four great law-givers[7] who erected on the Koran the superstructure of the ordinances of the Turks. Another probably was that the influence even of the Koran itself was much weakened by the prevalence of the mystical doctrine of *sooffeeism*, the tenets of which were mixed with those of the national faith from the very commencement of the dynasty of the sophis.

This twofold distinction may easily be shown to have corresponded well to the different relations of the two Mohammedan governments. The government of Persia, not coming into collision with the system of Europe, but affecting it only indirectly by occasionally restraining the violence of Turkey, did not require to be of that ruder character, which was essential to the agency of the Ottoman empire, while on the other hand, as it was the central government of Asia, some degree of refinement was necessary to it, that the Asiatics might be preserved from sinking into absolute barbarity[8]. A more despotic government was at the same time suited to the circumstances of Persia. Turkey, engaged in a perpetual struggle with the christian states, demanded some portion of the permanent vigour resulting from political control. Persia, but occasionally employed in restraining the operations of Turkey, might better be subjected to an unlimited authority, which should at one time be relaxed in the weakness of an effeminate voluptuary, at another be invigorated by the energy of a prince fitted to command.

The duration of the dynasty of the sophis was in a very remarkable manner accommodated to that of the vigour of the Turkish government, which it occasionally controlled. Its commencement occurred in the interval between the re-

[6] Sir J. Malcolm's Hist. of Persia, vol. ii. p. 429. [7] Ibid., p. 352.

[8] The Persian language is still through all the courts the medium of polite communication.

duction of Constantinople[9], which established the Turkish government within the limits of Europe, and the conquest of Egypt, which completed its strength, having preceded the latter event by fifteen years. The commencement of the new monarchy of Persia may therefore be considered as contemporary to that of the great power of the Ottoman government. The peace of Carlowitz, concluded in the year 1699, is on the other hand marked as the epoch[10], from which the Turkish power for ever ceased to be formidable to the Christian states; and at this time reigned in Persia the last of the sophis, who, after a reign of weakness, was in the year 1722 driven from the throne by an invasion of the neighbouring tribes of the Affghans.

Early in the sixteenth century the Turks had acquired the possession of all the countries adjacent to the Mediterranean, from the top of the Adriatic to the desert of Barca in Africa. The piratical states of Barbary, afterwards established under their protection, completed a chain of dominion, which embraced the whole of this area of ancient commerce except the small portion bordered by the Christian states of Europe. This position naturally placed them in opposition to the commerce of the Christians. A sense of common interest indeed soon induced them to confirm to the Venetians the great privileges of commerce[11], which that people had enjoyed in Egypt under the government of the Mamelukes, and even to assist them in their endeavours to repress the efforts, by which the Portuguese were opening a new and more advantageous communication with the east. But, though the Turks were thus induced to favour the declining commerce of the Venetians, and though various nations of Christians have maintained some languid traffic with the Levant, the general influence of the predominance of the Turkish power on the shores of the Mediterranean has had a contrary tendency, operating decisively to propel into the ocean the maritime exertion of the western nations, and thus to urge into activity that spirit of distant enterprise, which animated the

[9] The reduction of Constantinople was effected in the year 1453, the dynasty of the sophis was begun in the year 1502, and the Mamelukes of Egypt were subjugated in the year 1517. [10] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome iv. pp. 3, 4. [11] Robertson's Disquisition, p. 181.

sixteenth century. What barbarism and violence could do, has been accordingly effected. The resources of the richest countries in the world have been exhausted by an oppressive and ignorant government; the springs of commercial credit have been broken and destroyed by the capricious tyranny of an arbitrary administration; and a system of piratical depredation has been protected and encouraged, which, while it overpowered the weaker of the trading nations of the Christians, transferred the still remaining commerce of the Mediterranean to those more considerable states[12], whose marine had been aggrandised by the more extended commerce of the ocean.

While this was the general relation of the new government of Constantinople to the Christian nations, it maintained a special relation to the German empire in particular, through which it exercised an important influence on the internal arrangements of the system, in which the Christian nations were beginning to be combined. It is in regard to this particular relation, that the consideration of the distant government of Persia becomes necessary to a comprehensive view of the progress of European society. That Persia controlled the agency of Turkey, as it operated upon the empire, was so strongly felt in the sixteenth century, that Busbequius, who was during eight years ambassador of the Austrian court at Constantinople, has expressly represented the dread of that country as alone withholding the Turks from an overwhelming invasion of Germany[13], but affording it a respite, not a deliverance.

The German empire, on which that of Turkey exercised this special agency, was, it must be remembered, the great organ, by which the relations of a federative policy were extended over Europe. The Ottoman government, it appears therefore, was so circumstanced, as to bear most directly on the most influential member of the growing system of the west, and by acting on that state, which was as it were the heart of the great Christian confederacy, to affect generally

[12] De Witt, the celebrated statesman of the Dutch, regarded the Turkish corsairs as securing to his country the monopoly of the trade of the Mediterranean.—The True Interest and Political Maxims of the Republic of Holland, pp. 134, 135. [13] Busbequii Epist. pp. 174, 175.

the entire system. And it is observable, that the duration of the prosperity and power of European Turkey corresponded to this action upon the system, as that of the modern kingdom of Persia corresponded to the duration of the Turkish power, which it controlled. The Turks, who had established themselves in Europe soon after the middle of the fifteenth century, became early in the sixteenth formidable neighbours to the western nations, when the extraordinary aggrandisement of the house of Austria was giving a beginning to the combinations of the modern policy of Europe. The peace of Carlowitz again, concluded in the year 1699, which on the other hand marked the termination of the Ottoman greatness, occurred about two years after the peace of Ryswick, which decided the great struggle between France and the empire, by adjusting in favour of France the mutual relations of these two governments in a new period of the system of Europe, in which France, not Germany, should hold the ascendency.

The consideration of this relation of Turkey to the German empire discovers to us at the same time those which the fine, but unfortunate countries of Hungary, Walachia, and Moldavia, and the yet more barbarous regions adjacent to the Adriatic, have borne to the general system of European society. The former may be regarded as composing the debatable ground of the two empires. Governments so adverse in all their principles and usages could not be brought into an immediate vicinage, without exercising a hostility so unappeasable and uninterrupted, as could have been terminated only by subjugation of one of the two states. The continuance of their independent existence therefore, as combined with the action of the one upon the other, required, that they should be kept at a considerable distance by the interposition of countries, on which the violence of their fury might be exhausted, and yet incapable of constituting a barrier, by which the action of either upon the other might be precluded. Such a function appears to have been discharged by Walachia and Hungary [14]; Moldavia may per-

[14] The princes of Walachia and Moldavia acknowledged sometimes the sovereignty of Hungary, or of Poland, sometimes that of Turkey, until they were conquered by Solyman in the sixteenth century.—Ab. de l'Hist. des Traités, tome i. p. 419. In the year 1541 the same prince,

haps be considered rather as maintaining a similar relation to the northern governments of Poland and Russia. Walachia and Moldavia may indeed also be considered, as serving by their interposition to separate Hungary from the Black Sea, and thus at once to maintain that country in its connexion with the German empire, and to hinder it from interfering too much with the interests of Turkey.

While Hungary, Walachia, and Moldavia constituted a field of contention between Turkey and the Christian states, the yet ruder countries near to the Adriatic composed a barrier, which on that side completely separated the Christians and Mohammedans. In this their near approximation, where the narrow sea, by which they were divided, might have supplied an easy communication, the local circumstances of the Turkish frontier aggravated even to savageness the general barbarism, and secured the distinctness of the adverse powers by the absolute interruption of all the usages of civilised life. An open frontier would here have probably interfered with the German relation of Turkey, by directing to Italy, as a more attractive and more attainable object, the ambition of the Ottoman government. On this side accordingly communication was barred by the extreme savageness of a rude and impracticable region.

In examining the manner, in which Germany was affected by the efforts of Turkey and Persia during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, our attention is naturally attracted to three distinct periods of hostility among the Christian states, which exercised important influences on the general interests of Europe. The first of these comprehended the

availing himself of a disputed pretension to the crown of Hungary, possessed himself of the greater part of that kingdom, together with Sclavonia, abandoning some districts of the former, with Transylvania, to the prince whom he had received under his protection. By the truce concluded with the Turks in the year 1562, Ferdinand king of the Romans, who had claimed the whole kingdom in the right of his queen, was even constrained to pay to them an annual tribute for the portion which he retained.—Ab. de l'His. des Traités, tome ii. p. 158. In the year 1686 the Austrians recovered from the Turks all that portion of Hungary which these had possessed, and in the following also Transylvania and Sclavonia; and in the latter year the crown, which had been elective, was declared hereditary in the family of Austria, in consideration of the efforts exerted in rescuing the country from the Turks. Ibid., pp. 277, 278.

wars of the emperor Charles V. in the earlier part of the sixteenth century, which, while they favoured the efforts of religious reformation, gave a beginning to the arrangements of the Austrian period of the European system: the second comprised the great war of thirty years in the earlier part of the seventeenth, which brought the Austrian system to its adjustment, and at the same time prepared the subsequent ascendency of France: the third, towards the conclusion of the latter century, included those aggressions of Louis XIV., by which he established the ascendency of France over the empire, and began the second and improved period of the federative policy of Europe. In some or all of these periods of the agitation of Germany we might naturally expect to discover the action of Turkey on the German empire; and if in any of them that action should appear to have been suspended by the vigour and hostility of Persia, we might expect to perceive some special reason, why in that particular case it would have been inconvenient and embarrassing.

Solyman, who ascended the throne of Turkey in the year following that, in which Charles V. was placed on the throne of the German empire, undertook in the first year of his reign[15] to extend his empire from Constantinople westward into Europe, as far as it had already been extended towards the east; and with this design invaded Hungary and reduced Belgrade. This expedition occurred in the first campaign of the war of Charles and Francis I., as if to prove that Turkey was prepared to assist the operations of France by distressing the adverse government. The Turkish sovereign then left the two Christian princes to their own contention, turning his arms against Rhodes, occupied at that time by the knights of saint John of Jerusalem. These after an obstinate resistance were expelled, after which they were by the emperor stationed in Malta. When this decisive success had been gained in the Mediterranean, Hungary became again the field of enterprise for the Turks, who proceeded even to lay siege to Vienna. How aptly these incursions of the Turks were accommodated to the great struggle of the Protestants of Germany, has been already noticed in the review of the reign of the emperor Charles V., and needs not to be mentioned in this place. Sixteen years however

[15] Cantimir, tome ii. pp. 284, &c.

elapsed from the earlier invasion of Hungary, before the French monarch could overcome his repugnance to an alliance with the infidels. Necessity at length subdued his reluctance; a treaty of mutual assistance was concluded between France and Turkey; and Solyman became directly engaged in the political combinations of the Christian states.

The Turkish prince, who survived ten years the abdication of the emperor Charles V., employed this interval in collecting his resources for making a great and general impression on the empire[16]. This would however have been unseasonable, the struggle of the Protestants having been concluded; and we accordingly find that, when Solyman had just begun to execute his long meditated enterprise, the stroke of death arrested his career, and transferred his sceptre to his son. From this time moreover we find the power of Turkey directed to other objects through an interval of more than a century, which elapsed between the death of Solyman, in the year 1566, and the expedition undertaken against Vienna by Mohammed IV., in the year 1682, an interval comprehending, it must be observed, the German war of thirty years. It is now to be considered, whether any peculiar circumstances so distinguished this second period of German agitation from the preceding, as to constitute a case, in which that external agency of Turkey, which appears to have been then withheld, would have been embarrassing and prejudicial.

In the war of thirty years the protestant government of Sweden could, much better than a Mohammedan people, cooperate with the Protestants of Germany, then a privileged portion of its people, and be instrumental in facilitating a coalition between them and the Roman Catholics of France. Whoever shall recollect the jealousy, with which even Gustavus was originally regarded, and the difficulty, with which the Protestants of Germany were afterwards brought to place reliance on the assistance of French Roman Catholics, will be convinced, that an army of infidels would have been rejected as an unsuitable and odious instrument of protection, and must have proved to be incapable of effecting that combination of political interests, by which France was constituted the protector of the Protestants of Germany.

In the long interval of a hundred and twenty-six years,

[16] Cantimer, tome ii. pp. 337, 338.

which intervened between the conclusion of the first and the commencement of the last of the three grand periods of German agitation, the power of Turkey was effectually withheld by various causes from molesting the empire, but specially by the intervention of Persia in that important part of it, which was occupied by the German war of thirty years, when its interference would have been thus inconvenient and disturbing. Of this interval the ten remaining years of the reign of Solyman have been already described, as employed in preparing for a renewal of his German enterprises, which was however prevented by his death. In the reign of his successor Selim II. the Turkish arms were occupied with the war of the Mediterranean, fortunately also for Spain[17], at the time engaged in the last struggle with the Moors, to whom the sultan had promised to afford assistance[18], as soon as he should have effected the conquest of Cyprus. That island was reduced in the following year, but the Venetians in the famed battle of Lepanto, fought in the year 1571, struck a blow at the naval power of Turkey, such as that empire had never sustained since the defeat of Bajazet. The maritime strength of Turkey being then for ever enfeebled, the succeeding sovereign, Amurath III., abandoning European enterprises, turned his arms against the Mohammedan heretics of Persia. Ten years after the commencement of the reign of this prince began that of the great Abbas in Persia, which was extended through forty-two years, and constituted the period of the highest exaltation of that country, coincident too with four successive reigns of transitory princes on the Turkish throne. During the long reign of Abbas, and almost the whole of that which succeeded, the Turks were sufficiently occupied by the great power of Persia; and soon afterwards, or in the year 1645, hostilities were resumed against the Venetians, who still retained possession of Crete, or Candia, in the Archipelago. Though the conquest of the other parts of Candia was speedily effected, the capital was not reduced until the year 1669, when it had been vigorously assaulted during thirteen years. From this time the Turks were engaged with Poland and Russia[19] in disputes about the Cossacks, who had solicited their pro-

[17] Watson's Hist. of Philip II., vol. i. p. 256. [18] Cantimir, tome iii. p. 8. [19] Ibid., pp. 133, &c.

tection, until in the year 1682 they were invited into Hungary by an insurrection[20], when they again attacked the emperor.

Among the engagements, by which in this interval the power of Turkey was withheld from assailing the empire of Germany, we find a considerable place occupied by the wars of Persia, and we find the period of the great prosperity of Persia, the reign of the illustrious Abbas II., in that part of the interval which was extended from the year 1585 to the year 1627. While that prince was meditating[21] to deliver from the encroachment of the Turks some of the provinces of his empire, which they had reduced, two English knights Sir Anthony and Sir Robert Sherley, with twenty-six followers, happening to arrive in Persia[22], engaged in his service. By these men a body of infantry was disciplined, capable of encountering the Turkish janizaries, and the Persians were instructed in the management of artillery, in which they had been hitherto inferior to the Turks. The enterprising mind of Sir Anthony Sherley however was not satisfied with adding so much to the military strength of the government, to which he had thus attached himself. Agreeably to his own desire he was in the year 1602 deputed by Abbas to the christian sovereigns of Europe[23], by whom he was warmly welcomed for the grateful intelligence of the designs of that prince, the Turks being then the terror of Europeans. Nor were these designs unaccomplished, for from this time to his death the Persian prince not only checked the movements of the Turks, but also drove them successively from all their numerous and extensive pro-

[20] Cantimir, tome iii. p. 226. A cession of forty-eight villages, gained from the Poles in the year 1672, has been noticed as the last of their acquisitions of territory, and their decline is considered as having from that time commenced.—Ibid., p. 141. [21] Sir J. Malcolm, vol. i. p. 568.

[22] Sir Anthony Sherley had been encouraged by the earl of Essex to proceed with some soldiers of approved valour, to aid the duke of Ferrara against the pretensions of the pope, and the contest having been decided before his arrival by the submission of the duke, was then advised by the earl to go to Persia, which, on account of the commerce maintained by land with Turkey and Russia, and by sea with the Portuguese and Dutch, had about this time become an object of attention to the English.—Sir J. Malcolm, vol. i. pp. 531, 532.

[23] The Mohammedan prince evinced his tolerant disposition in a very remarkable manner, by becoming godfather to the first-born child of Sir Robert Sherley, to whom he had given a Circassian lady as his wife.—Ibid., p. 559.

vinces[24], which they had wrested from Persia. The government of Persia continued also to control that of Turkey ten years after the termination of the reign of Abbas, the year 1637 being assigned as the precise time, at which it ceased to maintain an equal struggle[25].

The commencement of the modern monarchy of Persia was but seventeen years antecedent to the election of the emperor Charles V., and the wars excited by the rivalry of this prince and Francis I. The rise of such a government could not fail to present to Turkey an object of jealous apprehension, and the efforts of the Ottoman empire accordingly were soon directed against this eastern rival; but these aggressions, though attended with immediate success, had only the effect of deterring the Turks from seeking in that direction the further gratification of their ambition[26], and inducing them to look for easier conquests in Egypt and in Europe. In the reign of Abbas II. Persia was strong enough to be the assailant; and it is observable that this reign did not terminate until the German war of thirty years had been already waged nine years, and that the ascendency of that country was sufficient during the ten succeeding years for controlling the power of Turkey. During nineteen years therefore of the thirty, Turkey was by Persia effectually withheld from interposing in the German war. The war of Candia, with its memorable siege, soon succeeded to occupy the Turkish arms, having been commenced in the year 1645.

In the third of the three periods of German hostility we find on the contrary the interposition of the Turkish government powerfully and decisively exercised, Vienna itself being besieged in this period[27], as in that of the emperor Charles V. As Louis XIV. was then pressing the emperor with various pretensions, which the latter[28], embarrassed by the hostilities of the Turks, was forced to concede, that interposition assisted in reducing the power and importance of the empire, when the rivalry of the political system of Europe was to be maintained under the presidency of France

[24] The Turks were successively driven from their possessions along the shores of the Caspian, from Aderbijan, Georgia, Kurdistan, Bagdad, Moosul, and Diabekir.—Sir J. Malcolm, vol. i. p. 541.

[25] Cantimir, tome iii. p. 88. [26] Revol. of Persia by Krusinski, vol. i. pp. 18, 22. [27] In the year 1683. [28] Pfeffel, tome ii. p. 405.

and Great Britain, the empire having descended to an inferior station. It had a further and important operation in disabling the empire for assisting the prince of Orange against the French, as it thereby drove that prince into a close connexion with Great Britain, which involved its government in all the combinations of continental policy, and gave a beginning to the later arrangements of the federative policy of Europe.

If Vienna had sunk under the attack of the infidels, too deep an impression would have been made upon the system of the Christian states. If it had been delivered by the energy of the German government, the attack, thus defeated, might have consolidated and invigorated that government, instead of assisting to reduce it to the secondary station, which it has since that time occupied. Both these consequences were precluded in the actual result, for Vienna was saved, and yet by no energy of its own government. The ambition of the visier[29] who aspired to establish for himself a new Mohammedan empire in the west, induced him to repress the ardour of his troops, that the treasures, which he already regarded as his own, might not in a successful assault become the prey of their rapacity. During the delay occasioned by this speculation, the fear of the common danger, and the promises of the German emperor and the Roman pontiff, prevailed with the Poles to compose the dissensions[30], by which their government had been recently paralysed, and to march under the conduct of the heroic Sobieski to the relief of Vienna and of Christendom.

Nor is it less remarkable among the occurrences of this interesting crisis, that the two governments, by which the Austrian capital was thus assailed and delivered, ceased from that very time to possess any considerable importance among the powers of Europe. Of this war it has been observed[31], that it effected an entire change in the policy of the Christian powers, as it regarded the Turks, the balance being from that time inclined so decidedly in favour of the former,

[29] Cantimir, tome iii. pp. 250—257. [30] It was represented to the queen of Poland, that the emperor would give his daughter in marriage to her son, who by the united influence of the emperor and the pope should be nominated to succeed his father.—Hist. of Poland, p. 190. [31] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome iv. pp. 3, 4.

that it became much more the object of those powers to devise means for retaining the latter in Europe, than to expel them. Turkey indeed ceased altogether from this time to act as a power of external compression, which could not continue to be necessary, when the system of Europe was assuming its later and improved arrangement. In the year 1741[32] the Ottoman court even invited the Christian princes to enter into relations of peace and amity, urging upon their attention the grievous calamities of war, and enforcing in the language of Christian morality the obligation of maintaining the general society of mankind. The history of Poland from the same time has been that of civil dissension, carried to the utmost excesses, which can be imagined of a people; beginning with proscribing all native princes from aspiring to the sovereignty, proceeding to a public offer of the crown for sale to the agents of foreign courts[33], and concluding, as might have been expected from so disgraceful preliminaries, in the partition of the territory among the neighbouring potentates. The ascendency acquired by Sobieski might indeed have secured to his family the succession of Poland, and thus have given some stability to an ill constituted government, if the intrigues of his consort in favour of a younger son had not obstructed the establishment of his family, and afforded to the radical vices of the constitution an opportunity of manifesting all the malignity of their influence.

During this struggle, in which Turkey acted a part so important, Persia was withheld from all interference by the weakness and decay consequent to the strictly arbitrary character of the government, which rendered the public welfare wholly dependent on the personal qualities of the sovereign. The four princes[34], who succeeded the illustrious Abbas, were immured in the harem with women and eunuchs, until they were called to the government of the empire. Weak or dissolute, they suffered all the principles of the public

[32] Mably, tome vi. p. 83. [33] The crown was actually exposed for sale in the year 1698. The pretenders bade for it to a degree of extravagance, but the avarice of the nobles was too great to be satisfied. After a long and violent struggle between the prince of Conti and the elector of Saxony, the latter gained possession of the throne.—Hist. of Poland, pp. 235, 246. [34] Sir J. Malcolm, vol. i. p. 576.

prosperity to perish by a continual decay. In vain did the policy and the toleration of Persia invite strangers from countries more improved, for no improvement could be naturalized under such a government; and at length, in the year 1722, a few rude tribes of Affghans, which on the common border of Persia and Hindostan had maintained a considerable degree of independence, put an end to this succession of imbecility[35] and possessed themselves of the dominion of a wasted people. The importance of the power of Persia, as a balance to that of Turkey, had ceased, when the latter no longer acted in compressing the system of Europe, or rather at a yet earlier period, when the agency of Turkey no longer required to be controlled.

The peace of Carlowitz concluded in the year 1699, which humbled the pride of Turkey, was the fruit of a larger confederacy of Christian governments than the union merely of Germany and Poland, the Venetians having acceded to that alliance in the year 1684, and the Russians having two years afterwards formed a league with the Poles. It was favoured also by yet more extensive combinations[36], for, while the peace of Ryswick, concluded with France in the year 1697, left the emperor at liberty to employ his whole force in Hungary, a war, which had arisen on the side of Persia, rendered the court of Constantinople anxious to accommodate its differences with the powers of Europe, which was accordingly effected by the mediation of the British government and of the Dutch republic. By the peace negotiated in these circumstances Transylvania, Sclavonia, and almost the whole of Hungary[37], were preserved to the emperor, who on his part was solicitous to prosecute his pretension to the crown of Spain. To the Poles the

[35] Fourteen years afterwards Nadir Shah expelled the barbarians, and began the regeneration of Persia. This revival however appears to have had relation, not to Turkey, but to Russia, the genius of Nadir having been exercised in defeating projects of the latter government, originally conceived by Peter the Great.—Sir J. Malcolm, vol. ii. pp. 21, 280. The north-western provinces of Persia were from the time of that prince an object of ambition to Russia. [36] Abrégé de l'Hist. des Traités, tome iv. p. 11. [37] The bannat of Temeswar alone was reserved to the Turks. The Maroch, the Theysse, the Save, and the Unna, were constituted the boundaries of the two empires.—Tabl. des Révol. de l'Europe, tome ii. p. 231.

territory formerly acquired from them by the Turks, was restored; to the Venetians the Morea[38] which they had conquered in the war, was ceded; with the Russians a truce of two years was concluded; which in the next year, by the peace of Constantinople[39], was extended to thirty.

[38] By the peace of Passarowitz, however, concluded in the year 1718, the Morea, which three years before had been reconquered by the Turks, was silently abandoned by the Venetians, and Turkey was re-established in its dominion of Greece. [39] By this treaty the important city of Azof, which commanded the communication with the Black-Sea, was ceded to the Russians, who had reduced it in the year 1696. In the year 1711, Azof was recovered by the Turks, and in the year 1774 it was restored to the Russians, together with some other places adjacent to that sea.—Tabl. des Révol. de l'Europe, tome ii. pp. 268, 271, 397. The temporary possession of Azof appears to have inspired Peter with his ambition of maritime greatness, for on gaining it he equipped his first fleet. A communication however having been in that interval opened with the Baltic, the loss of Azof served to direct the efforts of the Russians to that side, from which they might receive their greatest improvement; and the subsequent recovery of this place was accommodated to that increase of resources, which enabled them to grasp at maritime greatness on both sides of their extensive territory.

END OF VOLUME THE THIRD.

J. BILLING, PRINTER AND STEREOTYPER, WOKING, SURREY.

3.00
2.00
1.25
1.00
1.75
9.00
2.25
$6.75

BOHN'S CLASSICAL LIBRARY.

A Series of Literal Prose Translations of the Greek and Latin Classics with notes and indexes.

Uniform with the Standard Library, *5s. each (except Thucydides, Æschylus, Virgil, Horace, Cicero's Offices, Demosthenes, Appendix to Æschylus, Aristotle's Organon, all of which are 3s. 6d. each volume).*

1. **HERODOTUS.** By the Rev. Henry Cary, M.A. *Frontispiece.*
2 & 3. **THUCYDIDES.** By the Rev. H. Dale. In 2 Vols. (*3s. 6d.* each). *Frontispiece.*
4. **PLATO.** Vol. I. By Cary. [The Apology of Socrates, Crito, Phædo, Gorgias, Protagotas, Phædrus, Theætetus, Euthyphron, Lysis.] *Frontispiece.*
5. **LIVY'S HISTORY OF ROME,** literally translated. Vol. I., Books 1 to 8.
6. **PLATO.** Vol. II. By Davis. [The Republic, Timæus, and Critias.]
7. **LIVY'S HISTORY OF ROME.** Vol. II., Books 9 to 26.
8. **SOPHOCLES.** The Oxford Translation, revised.
9. **ÆSCHYLUS,** literally translated. By an Oxonian. (Price *3s. 6d.*)
9* ———— Appendix to, containing the new readings given in Hermann's posthumous edition of Æschylus, translated and edited by G. Burges, M.A. (*3s. 6d.*).
10. **ARISTOTLE'S RHETORIC AND POETIC.** With Examination Questions.
11. **LIVY'S HISTORY OF ROME.** Vol. III., Books 27 to 36.
12 & 14. **EURIPIDES,** literally translated. From the Text of Dindorf. In 2 Vols.
13. **VIRGIL.** By Davidson. New Edition, Revised. (Price *3s. 6d.*) *Frontispiece.*
15. **HORACE.** By Smart. New Edition, Revised. (Price *3s. 6d.*) *Frontispiece.*
16. **ARISTOTLE'S ETHICS.** By Prof. R. W. Browne, of King's College.
17. **CICERO'S OFFICES.** [Old Age, Friendship, Scipio's Dream, Paradoxes, &c.]
18. **PLATO.** Vol. III. By G. Burges, M.A. [Euthydemus, Symposium, Sophistes, Politicus, Laches, Parmenides, Cratylus, and Meno.]
19. **LIVY'S HISTORY OF ROME.** Vol. IV. (which completes the work).
20. **CÆSAR AND HIRTIUS.** With Index.
21. **HOMER'S ILIAD,** in prose, literally translated. *Frontispiece.*
22. **HOMER'S ODYSSEY,** Hymns, Epigrams, and Battle of the Frogs and Mice.
23. **PLATO.** Vol. IV. By G. Burges, M.A. [Philebus, Charmides, Laches, The Two Alcibiades, and Ten other Dialogues.]
24, 25, & 32. **OVID.** By H. T. Riley, B.A. Complete in 3 Vols. *Frontispieces.*
26. **LUCRETIUS.** By the Rev. J. S. Watson. With the Metrical Version of J. M. Good.
27, 30, 31, & 34. **CICERO'S ORATIONS.** By C. D. Yonge. Complete in 4 Vols. (Vol. 4 contains also the Rhetorical Pieces.)
28. **PINDAR.** By Dawson W. Turner. With the Metrical Version of Moore. *Front.*
29. **PLATO.** Vol. V. By G. Burges, M.A. [The Laws.]
33 & 36. **THE COMEDIES OF PLAUTUS,** By H. T. Riley, B.A. In 2 Vols.
35. **JUVENAL, PERSIUS,** &c. By the Rev. L. Evans, M.A. With the Metrical Version of Gifford. *Frontispiece.*
37. **THE GREEK ANTHOLOGY,** translated chiefly by G. Burges, A.M., with Metrical Versions by various Authors.
38. **DEMOSTHENES.** The Olynthiac, Philippic, and other Public Orations, with Notes, Appendices, &c., by C. Rann Kennedy. (*3s. 6d.*)

39. **SALLUST, FLORUS,** and **VELLEIUS PATERCULUS**, with copious Notes, Biographical Notices, and Index, by the Rev. J. S. WATSON, M.A.

40. **LUCAN'S PHARSALIA**, with copious Notes, by H. T. RILEY, B.A.

41 **THEOCRITUS, BION, MOSCHUS** and **TYRTÆUS**, by the Rev. J. BANKS, M.A. With the Metrical Versions of CHAPMAN. *Frontispiece.*

42. **CICERO'S ACADEMICS, DE FINIBUS** and **TUSCULAN QUESTIONS**, by C. D. YONGE, B.A. With Sketch of the Greek Philosophy.

43. **ARISTOTLE'S POLITICS AND ECONOMICS**, by E. WALFORD, M.A., with Notes, Analyses, Life, Introduction, and Index.

44. **DIOGENES LAERTIUS. LIVES AND OPINIONS OF THE ANCIENT PHILOSOPHERS**, with Notes by C. D. YONGE, B.A.

45. **TERENCE** and **PHÆDRUS**, by H. T. RILEY. To which is added SMART'S Metrical Version of Phædrus. *Frontispiece.*

46 & 47. **ARISTOTLE'S ORGANON**, or, Logical Treatises, and the Introduction of Porphyry, with Notes, Analysis, Introduction and Index, by the Rev. O. F. OWEN, M.A. 2 Vols., *3s. 6d.* per Vol.

48 & 49. **ARISTOPHANES**, with Notes and Extracts from the best Metrical Versions, by W. J. HICKIE, in 2 Vols. *Frontispiece.*

50. **CICERO ON THE NATURE OF THE GODS, DIVINATION, FATE, LAWS, REPUBLIC, &c**, translated by C. D. YONGE, B.A.

51. **APULEIUS.** [The Golden Ass, Death of Socrates, Florida, and Defence or Discourse on Magic]. To which is added a Metrical Version of Cupid and Psyche; and Mrs. Tighe's Psyche. *Frontispiece.*

52. **JUSTIN, CORNELIUS NEPOS** and **EUTROPIUS**, with Notes and a General Index, by the Rev. J. S. WATSON, M.A.

53 & 58. **TACITUS.** Vol. I. The Annals. Vol. II. The History, Germania, Agricola, &c. With Index.

54. **PLATO.** Vol VI., completing the work, and containing Epinomis, Axiochus, Eryxias, on Virtue, on Justice, Sisyphus, Demodocus, and Definitions; the Treatise of Timæus Locrus on the Soul of the World and Nature; the Lives of Plato by Diogenes Laertius, Hesychius, and Olympiodorus; and the Introductions to his Doctrines by Alcinous and Albinus; Apuleius on the Doctrines of Plato, and Remarks on Plato's Writings by the Poet Gray. Edited, with Notes, by G. BURGES, M.A., Trin. Coll., Camb. With general Index to the 6 Volumes.

55, 56. 57. **ATHENÆUS.** The Deipnosophists, or the Banquet of the Learned, translated by C. D. YONGE, B.A., with an Appendix of Poetical Fragments rendered into English verse by various Authors, and a general Index. Complete in 3 Vols.

59. **CATULLUS, TIBULLUS,** and the **VIGIL OF VENUS.** A literal prose translation. To which are added Metrical Versions by LAMB, GRAINGER, and others. *Frontispiece.*

60. **PROPERTIUS,** PETRONIUS ARBITER, and JOHANNES SECUNDUS, literally translated, and accompanied by Poetical Versions, from various sources; to which are added the Love Epistles of ARISTÆNETUS. Edited by W. K. KELLY.

61. **THE GEOGRAPHY OF STRABO,** translated, with copious Notes, by W. FALCONER, M.A., and H. C. HAMILTON, Esq. In 3 Vols. Vol. I.

62. **XENOPHON'S ANABASIS,** or Expedition of Cyrus, and **MEMORABILIA,** or Memoirs of Socrates, translated by the Rev. J. S. WATSON, with a Geographical Commentary by W. F. AINSWORTH. *Frontispiece.*

63 ———— CYROPÆDIA and HELLENICS, by the Rev. H. DALE, and the Rev. J. S. WATSON.

BOHN'S CLASSICAL LIBRARY.

64. **PLINY'S NATURAL HISTORY,** translated, with copious Notes, by the late JOHN BOSTOCK, M.D., F.R.S., and H. T. RILEY, Esq., B.A. Vol. 1.

65. **SUETONIUS.** Lives of the Cæsars, and other Works. THOMSON'S translation revised by T. FORESTER.

BOHN'S ANTIQUARIAN LIBRARY.

Uniform with the STANDARD LIBRARY, *price* 5*s.*,

1. **BEDE'S ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, & THE ANGLO-SAXON CHRONICLE.**
2. **MALLET'S NORTHERN ANTIQUITIES.** By BISHOP PERCY. With Abstract of the Erbyggia Saga, by SIR WALTER SCOTT. Edited by J. A. BLACKWELL.
3. **WILLIAM OF MALMESBURY'S CHRONICLE OF THE KINGS OF ENGLAND.**
4. **SIX OLD ENGLISH CHRONICLES:** viz., Asser's Life of Alfred; the Chronicles of Ethelwerd, Gildas, Nennius, Geoffry of Monmouth, and Richard of Cirencester.
5. **ELLIS'S EARLY ENGLISH METRICAL ROMANCES.** Revised by J. ORCHARD HALLIWELL. Complete in one vol., *Illuminated Frontispiece.*
6. **CHRONICLES OF THE CRUSADERS:** Richard of Devizes. Geoffrey de Vinsauf. Lord de Joinville. Complete in 1 volume. *Frontispiece.*
7. **EARLY TRAVELS IN PALESTINE.** Willibald, Saewulf, Benjamin of Tudela, Mandeville, La Brocquiere, and Maundrell. In one volume. *With Map.*
8, 10, & 12. **BRAND'S POPULAR ANTIQUITIES OF GREAT BRITAIN.** By SIR HENRY ELLIS. In 3 Vols.
9 & 11. **ROGER OF WENDOVER'S FLOWERS OF HISTORY** (formerly ascribed to Matthew Paris.) In 2 Vols.
13. **KEIGHTLEY'S FAIRY MYTHOLOGY.** Enlarged. *Frontispiece* by CRUIKSHANK.
14, 15, & 16. **SIR THOMAS BROWNE'S WORKS.** Edited by SIMON WILKIN. *Portrait.* In 3 Vols. With Index.
17, 19, & 31. **MATTHEW PARIS'S CHRONICLE,** containing the History of England from 1235, translated by DR. GILES, with Index to the whole, including the portion published under the name of ROGER OF WENDOVER, in 3 Vols. (See 9 & 11). *Portrait.*
18. **YULE-TIDE STORIES.** A collection of Scandinavian Tales and Traditions, edited by B. THORPE, Esq.
20 & 23. **ROGER DE HOVEDEN'S ANNALS OF ENGLISH HISTORY,** from A.D. 732 to A.D. 1201. Translated and edited by H. T. RILEY, Esq., B.A. In 2 Vols.
21. **HENRY OF HUNTINGDON'S HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH,** from the Roman Invasion to Henry II.; with The Acts of King Stephen, &c. Translated and edited by T. FORESTER, Esq., M.A.

22. **PAULI'S LIFE OF ALFRED THE GREAT.** To which is appended **ALFRED'S ANGLO-SAXON VERSION OF OROSIUS,** with a literal translation. Notes, and an Anglo-Saxon Grammar and Glossary, by B. THORPE, Esq.

24 & 25. **MATTHEW OF WESTMINSTER'S FLOWERS OF HISTORY,** especially such as relate to the affairs of Britain, from the beginning of the world to A.D. 1307. Translated by C. D. YONGE, B.A. In 2 Vols.

26. **LEPSIUS'S LETTERS FROM EGYPT, ETHIOPIA,** and the **PENINSULA OF SINAI.** Revised by the Author. Translated by LEONORA and JOANNA B. HORNER. With Maps and Coloured View of Mount Barkal.

27, 28, & 30. **ORDERICUS VITALIS.** His Ecclesiastical History of England and Normandy, translated, with Notes and the Introduction of Guizot, by T. FORESTER, M.A. In 3 Vols.

29. **INGULPH'S CHRONICLE OF THE ABBEY OF CROYLAND,** with the Continuations by Peter of Blois and other Writers. Translated, with Notes and an Index, by H. T. RILEY, B.A.

32. **LAMB'S SPECIMENS OF ENGLISH DRAMATIC POETS** of the time of Elizabeth; including his Selections from the Garrick Plays.

33. **MARCO POLO'S TRAVELS,** the translation of Marsden, edited, with Notes and Introduction, by T. WRIGHT, M.A., F.S.A., &c.

34. **FLORENCE OF WORCESTER'S CHRONICLE,** with the Two Continuations; comprising Annals of English History, from the Departure of the Romans to the Reign of Edward I. Translated, with Notes, by T. FORESTER, Esq.

35. **HAND-BOOK OF PROVERBS,** comprising the whole of Ray's Collection, and a complete Alphabetical Index, in which are introduced large Additions collected by HENRY G. BOHN.

BOHN'S PHILOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

Uniform with the STANDARD LIBRARY, *price 5s. per Volume.*

1. **TENNEMANN'S MANUAL** of the **HISTORY** of **PHILOSOPHY,** revised and continued by J. R. MORELL.

2. **ANALYSIS** and **SUMMARY** of **HERODOTUS,** with synchronistical Table of Events, Tables of Weights, Money, &c.

3. **TURNER'S (DAWSON W.) NOTES TO HERODOTUS,** for the use of Students. With Map, Appendices, and Index.

4. **LOGIC,** or the **SCIENCE OF INFERENCE,** a popular Manual, by J. DEVEY.

5. **ANALYSIS** and **SUMMARY** of **THUCYDIDES,** by T. WHEELER. New Edition, with the addition of a complete Index.

BOHN'S BRITISH CLASSICS.

Uniform with the STANDARD LIBRARY, *price 3s. 6d. per Volume.*

1, 3, 5, 8, 11 & 14. **GIBBON'S ROMAN EMPIRE**; Complete and Unabridged, with variorum Notes, including, in addition to all the Author's own, those of Guizot, Wenck, Niebuhr, Hugo, Neander, and other foreign scholars. Edited by an ENGLISH CHURCHMAN, *with Portrait and Maps.*

2, 4, & 6. **ADDISON'S WORKS,** with the Notes of BISHOP HURD. *With Portrait and Engravings on Steel.*

7. **DEFOE'S WORKS,** Edited by SIR WALTER SCOTT. Vol 1. Containing the Life, Adventure, and Piracies of Captain Singleton, and the Life of Colonel Jack. *Portrait of Defoe.*

9 **DEFOE'S WORKS,** Vol. 2. Containing Memoirs of a Cavalier, Adventures of Captain Carleton, Dickory Cronke, &c.

10. **PRIOR'S LIFE OF BURKE,** (forming the 1st Volume of BURKE'S WORKS), new Edition, revised by the Author. *Portrait.*

12. **BURKE'S WORKS,** Vol 1, containing his Vindication of Natural Society, Essay on the Sublime and Beautiful, and various Political Miscellanies.

13. **DEFOE'S WORKS,** Edited by SIR WALTER SCOTT. Vol. 3. Containing the Life of Moll Flanders, and the History of the Devil.

15. **BURKE'S WORKS.** Vol. 2, containing Essay on the French Revolution, Political Letters and Speeches.

BOHN'S ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY.

Uniform with the STANDARD LIBRARY, *price 5s. per Volume.*

1. **EUSEBIUS' ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,** Translated from the Greek, with Notes.

2. **SOCRATES' ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY,** in continuation of EUSEBIUS, with the Notes of VALESIUS.

3. **THEODORET AND EVAGRIUS.** Ecclesiastical Histories, from A.D. 332 to A.D. 427, and from A.D. 431 to A.D. 544. Translated from the Greek, with General Index.

4. **THE WORKS OF PHILO JUDÆUS,** translated from the Greek by C. D. YONGE, B.A. Vol. 1.

5. **PHILO JUDÆUS,** Vol. 2.

6. **SOZOMEN'S ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY** from A.D. 324–440: and the Ecclesiastical History of PHILOSTORGIUS, translated from the Greek, with a Memoir of the Author, by E. WALFORD, M.A.

7. **PHILO JUDÆUS,** Vol. 3.

BOHN'S SHILLING SERIES.

*Those marked *, being Double Volumes, are* 1*s.* 6*d.*

1. EMERSON'S REPRESENTATIVE MEN.
2. IRVING'S LIFE OF MAHOMET.*
3. THE GENUINE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.
4. WILLIS'S PEOPLE I HAVE MET.*
5. IRVING'S SUCCESSORS OF MAHOMET.*
6. ——— LIFE OF GOLDSMITH.*
7. ——— SKETCH-BOOK.*
8. ——— TALES OF A TRAVELLER.*
9. ——— TOUR ON THE PRAIRIES.
10 & 11. —— CONQUESTS OF GRANADA AND SPAIN. 2 Vols.*
12 & 13. —— LIFE OF COLUMBUS. 2 Vols.*
14. ——— COMPANIONS OF COLUMBUS.*
15 & 16. TAYLOR'S EL DORADO; or, Pictures of the Gold Region. 2 Vols.
17. IRVING'S ADVENTURES OF CAPTAIN BONNEVILLE.*
18. ——— KNICKERBOCKER.*
19. ——— TALES OF THE ALHAMBRA.*
20. ——— CONQUEST OF FLORIDA.*
21. ——— ABBOTSFORD AND NEWSTEAD.
22. ——— SALMAGUNDI.*
23. ——— BRACEBRIDGE HALL.*
24. ——— ASTORIA (*Portrait of the Author*). 2 Vols. in 1. 2*s.*
25. LAMARTINE'S GENEVIEVE; or, The History of a Servant Girl. Translated by A. R. SCOBLE.*
26. MAYO'S BERBER; or, The Mountaineer of the Atlas. A Tale of Morocco.
27. WILLIS'S LIFE HERE AND THERE; or, Sketches of Society and Adventure.*
28. GUIZOT'S LIFE OF MONK, with Appendix and *Portrait.**
29. THE CAPE AND THE KAFFIRS: A Diary of Five Years' Residence, with Advice to Emigrants. By H. WARD. *Plate and Map of the Seat of War.* 2*s.*
30. WILLIS'S HURRY-GRAPHS; or, Sketches of Scenery, Celebrities, and Society, taken from Life.*
31. HAWTHORNE'S HOUSE OF THE SEVEN GABLES. A Romance.
32. LONDON AND ITS ENVIRONS; with Historical and Descriptive Sketch of the Great Exhibition. By CYRUS REDDING. *Numerous Illustrations.* 2*s.*
33. LAMARTINE'S STONEMASON OF SAINT POINT.*
34. GUIZOT'S MONK'S CONTEMPORARIES. A Series of Biographic Studies on the English Revolution. *Portrait of Edward Lord Clarendon.*
35. HAWTHORNE'S TWICE-TOLD TALES.
36. ——— The same, Second Series.
37. ——— SNOW IMAGE, and other Tales.
38. ——— SCARLET LETTER.
39. EMERSON'S ORATIONS AND LECTURES.
40. UNCLE TOM'S CABIN; or, Life among the Lowly; with Introductory Remarks by the REV. J. SHERMAN.
41. THE WHITE SLAVE. A new picture of American Slave Life.
42. DAYS OF BATTLE; or, Quatre Bras and Waterloo. By an ENGLISHWOMAN, resident at Brussels in June, 1815, (author of Rome in the Nineteenth Century).

43. GERVINUS' INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY, translated from the German (*with a Memoir of the Author*).

44. CARPENTER'S (DR. W. B.) PHYSIOLOGY OF TEMPERANCE AND TOTAL ABSTINENCE, being an Examination of the Effects of the excessive, moderate, and occasional use of Alcoholic Liquors on the Human System (or *on fine paper, bound in cloth*, 2*s.* 6*d.*)

BOHN'S MINIATURE LIBRARY.

Foolscap 12*mo. elegantly bound in morocco cloth.*

BARBAULD AND AIKIN'S EVENINGS AT HOME. *Frontispieces.* 3*s.*

BOURRIENNE'S MEMOIRS OF NAPOLEON. *Portrait and Frontisp.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

BUNYAN'S PILGRIM'S PROGRESS. With a Life and Notes by SCOTT, containing all in Southey's Edition. 25 *Woodcuts, by* HARVEY, *Frontisp.* &c. 3*s.* 6*d.*

——— CHEEVER'S LECTURES ON, *Frontisp.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

BYRON'S POETICAL WORKS, in 1 thick Volume, including several suppressed Poems not included in other editions. *Beautiful Frontispiece.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

——— DON JUAN, complete. *Frontispieces.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

COLERIDGE'S SELECT POETICAL WORKS. 2*s.*

COWPER'S POETICAL WORKS, with Life by SOUTHEY, including all the copyright Poems (700 pages). *Beautiful Frontispieces after* HARVEY, *by* GOODALL. 3*s.* 6*d.*

DRYDEN'S POETICAL WORKS, complete in 1 Vol., with *a Portrait, Frontispiece, and Vignette Title.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF MANNERS AND ETIQUETTE, comprising an improved edition of Chesterfield's Advice to his Son on Men and Manners. 2*s.*

HEBER'S (BP.) & MRS. HEMANS' POETICAL WORKS. 3 Vols. in 1. *Fronts.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

HERRICK'S POETICAL WORKS, complete. *Frontispiece.* 3*s.*

JOE MILLER'S JEST BOOK. *Frontispiece.* 3*s.*

LONGFELLOW'S POETICAL WORKS, viz.—Voices of the Night—Evangeline—Seaside and Fireside—Spanish Students—Translations. *Portrait and Frontisp.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

——— PROSE WORKS, viz.—Outre-Mer—Hyperion—Kavanagh. 2*s.* 6*d.*

MILTON'S POETICAL WORKS, with Life and Notes by DR. STEBBING; and Dr. Channing's Essay on Milton. *Frontispiece.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

NEW JOE MILLER, a Selection of Modern Jests, Witticisms, Droll Tales, &c. 2*s.* 6*d.*

OSSIAN'S POEMS, with Dissertations by MACPHERSON and Dr. Blair. *Frontisp.* 3*s.*

POPE'S HOMER'S ILIAD. Essay on Homer. Notes and Essays. *Frontispiece.* 3*s.*

——— ODYSSEY, (uniform). *Frontispiece.* 3*s.*

SCOTT'S POETICAL WORKS, and Life, in one volume. *Port. and Frontisp.* 3*s.* 6*d.*

STURM'S REFLECTIONS ON THE WORKS OF GOD. *Frontisp.* 3*s.*

THOMPSON'S SEASONS. With his Castle of Indolence, 4 *beautiful Woodcuts.* 2*s.*

VATHEK, AND THE AMBER WITCH. 2 vols. in 1. 2*s.* 6*d.*

D102 .M64 v.3
History,
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00021 5964